LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
FEB 6 1931
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Division DS 73
Section .1.S74

MESOPOTAMIAN ORIGINS

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
FEB 6 1931
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

MESOPOTAMIAN ORIGINS

THE BASIC POPULATION
of the
NEAR EAST

By
EPHRAIM A. SPEISER
Assistant Professor of Semitics
University of Pennsylvania

PHILADELPHIA
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA PRESS
LONDON
HUMPHREY MILFORD: OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
1930

Copyright 1930
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA PRESS

Printed in the United States of America

Dedicated to the

AMERICAN SCHOOLS
OF
ORIENTAL RESEARCH

PREFACE

It will probably seem rash and premature to attempt at this time a sketch of Mesopotamian origins, when scarcely a month passes without some important discovery in one or the other of the ancient Bible Lands. But it is precisely because of these discoveries that a fresh study of the material now extant may be found both advisable and useful. The Near East, past as well as present, holds today the interest of the scholar and the layman. The ever restless tribes of the Orient compel almost universal attention; and the oldest centers of civilization have a peculiar fascination for even the casual observer. The picture, however, is complex as a whole, and the details are all too often confusing and obscure. The present study has essayed the task of clarifying the contours of that picture. If this aim has been at all achieved, the book may be held justified.

The central thesis of this essay is, briefly, that nearly all of the hitherto unclassified cultures and peoples of the ancient Near East can be organized into a single, genetically interrelated, group; the members of that group formed the basic population of Hither Asia, produced its earliest civilizations, and have continued to this day to furnish its ethnic background.

The approach to the subject—and this point will bear stressing—has been threefold: archaeology, historical records, and the internal evidence of philology, have all been brought into the investigation. It will be evident that no exhaustive treatment of any of these essentially independent disciplines has been attempted in the following pages. To present the sum of facts, attested and alleged, gathered from three such diverse fields, would have required a work of encyclopedic proportions;

it would have certainly exceeded by far the competence of the author. Moreover, in a work of this kind, where the main argument should be constantly kept in the foreground, one must beware lest the details overshadow the whole. On the other hand, a synthetic coordination of results arrived at independently in several autonomous branches of research, could conceivably be ventured with rather less diffidence. Such a study might even prove of greater immediate value since the comparative method serves to broaden the scope and to provide a mutual check for the main results.

In course of the discussion the present author was constrained to depart on a number of occasions from current interpretations and to suggest solutions that appeared to derive from the available evidence more effective support. The argument required as a consequence careful and complete documentation. This will account for the unusual prominence given to the footnotes, which have taken up one-third of the total space; they may help to justify the existence of the book, though they will hardly enhance its outward appearance. It is perhaps needless to add that not all of the material assembled could be utilized without seriously distorting the relative importance of text and comments. However, it is doubtless true that some studies have been, unfortunately, overlooked which might have proved really relevant to the present theme; the wish to avoid such omissions is more pious than simple and easy of fulfilment.

Of the author's indebtedness to the many workers in the field of Oriental History and Philology the notes will bear the best and most eloquent testimony. The kind invitation of the American Philosophical Society, extended through Doctor Cyrus Adler, to prepare a paper on Early Civilizations, furnished the incentive to present this study in writing. The encouragement and interest of Professor George A. Barton have been to the writer of inestimable help, and a constant source of inspiration. Professor James A. Montgomery had the goodness, and the patience, to read the manuscript and the entire proof; it is a foregone conclusion that this book has benefited greatly by his generosity. The author has also enjoyed the assistance of members of his Seminar in Ancient Oriental History: Miss M. Rogers Warren was good enough to go over the entire manuscript, while Mr. Allan A. MacRae and Mr. Z. Harris read portions of the proof.

One acknowledgment has been left for the end. To the American Schools of Oriental Research the author owes much of what may be new and useful in this work. The personal knowledge of most of the territories with which the present study deals, the acquaintance with the topographical intricacies of the Central Zagros, the survey and excavation of sites containing prehistoric painted pottery, and the extensive study of the Hurrian documents from the Kirkuk area, are all due to opportunities provided directly or indirectly by the Schools, in conjunction with the Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, the Dropsie College, and the Harvard Expedition under Professor Edward Chiera. For more than a quarter of a century the Schools have been an important factor in the field of Oriental Research. Their work was carried on under precarious financial circumstances. Now that the leanest years have been left behind, thanks to a generous grant from the Rockefeller Foundation, it is peculiarly fitting to look back upon that period and to commemorate its scientific accomplishments. To do so is indeed a rare privilege; if the present contribution be thought too slender to warrant this distinction, the presumption may be mitigated by the circumstance that the act is not untimely.

Philadelphia, July 15th, 1930.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

THE BACKGROUND

Ancient boundaries greatly extended—Intimate contacts between early civilizations—Confusing ethnic conditions in the third millennium—A large group of peoples awaiting further identification—Kretschmer's study of pre-Grecian place-names and the decipherment of Elamite by Heinrich Winkler—Non-Semitic languages preserved in the cuneiform script—The "Caucasian" hypothesis alluring—Caucasian philology in an embryonic state—The valuable work of Adolf Dirr—Hasty conclusions of Caucasian scholars—The theories of N. Marr untenable—The need for a useful designation to replace "Caucasian"—Circumspect application of the term "Japhethite" proposed—Premature conclusions of Trombetti—Philological and archaeological results to be coordinated—The distribution of First and Second Aeneolithic (Susa I and II)—Lines of investigation converge in Anatolia—Numerous preliminary studies essential—Scope of present work limited to Mesopotamia and immediate neighbors 1

CHAPTER II

ELAM AND SUMER IN THE EPIGRAPHICAL SOURCES

The designations for Elam—The nature of the epigraphical material—Phonetic peculiarities—The subject suffixes—Elam in Sumero-Akkadian sources—Ceaseless wars with Sumer and Akkad—The fall of Sumer—The testimony of tradition—The king lists largely vindicated by recent finds—The Awan Dynasty of Elamite origin—Wars with Elam traced back to First Dynasty of Kish—Philological evidence—The "prediluvian" place-names predominantly Elamite—Names ending in *ak* and *ir*—Awan and Awak identical—The pre-Sumerian population of Lower Mesopotamia—Names ending in a sibilant—The internal evidence of Sumerian dialects—Phonetic traces of a pre-Sumerian substratum—*Eme Ku* and *Eme Sal*—Phonetic correspondences—A probable labiovelar in the northern dialect—*Eme Sal* localized in Akkad—The origin of the name "Sumer"—Suggestive traces of palatalization—Recapitulation 26

CHAPTER III

THE EARLIEST CIVILIZATIONS OF THE NEAR EAST

The oldest strata of Musyan—The First Style of Susa—Susian pottery—Other First Aeneolithic sites—The extraordinary expansion of First Aeneolithic—Southern and Nothern Mesopotamia—The First Style probably of sub-Caucasian origin—The remarkable agreement between archaeological and philological data—The problem of Jemdet Nasr—Second Style—Its characteristics and distribution—Significant western connections—Jemdet Nasr only superficially Sumerian—Original home of Second Aeneolithic—Ethnic representatives—The evidence from Tepe Gawra—Common ultimate origin of both styles—Proto-Elamites, Sumerians, and Semites—First Aeneolithic supplanted—Simultaneous appearance of the Second Style and of the Sumerians—Temporary political impasse—Sumerian contributions 59

CHAPTER IV

THE LULLU AND THE GUTI

The peoples of the Central Zagros—The valley of Shehrizor—The Lullu in the third millennium—Later history—Lullu and Elamite place-names related—The labial ending—The spread of the Lullu—The Dynasty of Gutium—Gutian personal names—The name "Lagash" —Phonetic peculiarities—Alleged relationship of Gutians and Indo-Europeans—The documentary basis for the theory reviewed—The myth of Gutian blondness—The application of the word *namru*—Gutians in Assyria—References in Assyrian annals—The Guti and the Qurti—The Qurti and the Kurds—The antiquity of the Kurds—The suffix *hi*—The Kurds originally a Zagros-Japhethite people 87

CHAPTER V

THE KASSITES AND THE HURRIANS

Foreign rulers in the second millennium—The Kassites—The language of the Kassites—Ethnic affiliations—The Hurrians—The name "Subartu" a grographical term—The "Mitanni"—The Hurrians in the archives of Boghazkoi—Horites and Hurrians—The Hurrians in Palestine—Hanigalbat, Mitanni, Subartu, and Hurri—The philological position of Hurrian—Relationship with the Elamites—The evidence of Hurrian proper names—Origin of the name "Hanigalbat"—Hurrian words and formatives—Hurrians as the western counterpart of the Elamites—Hurrian elements in Sumer and Akkad

—Important traces in the First Dynasty of Kish—The Hurrian-Elamite group the original population of Mesopotamia—The Hurrian substratum in Palestine and Syria—Hurrians and Assyrians—Palestine and Babylonia—Prediluvian kings and patriarchs—Western versions of the Gilgamesh Epic—The names of the prediluvian patriarchs not derived from Babylonia—Habiru and Hurrians 120

CHAPTER VI

OTHER CONTACTS—CONCLUSION

Anatolia and Armenia—The pre-Indo-European Anatolians—The position of Haldian—The oldest civilizations in the lands of the Fertile Crescent—The third ethnic element of ancient Eurasia—Fusions with Semites, and Indo-Europeans—Cultural dependence, and unusual tenacity of physical characteristics—The basic population of the Near East—Its rôle in Mesopotamian history greatly underestimated—Long periods of Japhethite domination—The age-long struggle for the Fertile Crescent 164

BIBLIOGRAPHY 179

INDEX 191

CHAPTER I

THE BACKGROUND

ANCIENT Oriental History is, in the present sense of the term, a discipline of ever changing, ever increasing scope. The numerous gaps in its structure are being gradually filled, and its beginnings are constantly moved back and down by the busy spade of the excavator. What was the most ancient East of yesterday constitutes at present an advanced chapter in the history of early civilizations, which have been made articulate through the researches and discoveries of the last few decades. Today the origins of Oriental history lie largely within a period that until recently was left almost entirely to prehistoric research. The age of Hammurabi, the time of the XIIth Dynasty of Egypt, the Third Minoan period, appear to us now as comparatively modern, although it is not so long ago that the turn of the third millennium was within the realm of legend rather than of history. A round millennium has thus been added to the scope of historical investigation, and the present decade is mainly responsible for this considerable extension.[1]

It is natural, then, that our traditional conception of the rôle and distribution of the oldest cultural centers should require modification. Not that Mesopotamia, Egypt, and the Aegean, can be displaced from the positions which they have hitherto held; but the center of gravity is shifting, slowly and almost imperceptibly, and seats of civilization are beginning to appear on the peripheries. Eastern Anatolia, Armenia, Elam, and India, cannot now be kept out of the exclusive circle of ancient cultures. It is as yet far too early to realize the full implication of this enormous extension of ancient boundaries;[2] but the appearance of so many new elements makes a preliminary rearrangement of the available material, and a slight shifting of emphasis, not only desirable, but imperative.

---

[1] A very good illustration is furnished by our recent change of attitude towards the First Dynasty of Ur. As late as 1920, B. Meissner was perfectly justified in writing: "Namen wie *Mesannipada* oder *Meskiagnunna* sagen uns vorläufig noch nichts." (*Babylonien und Assyrien* I 23.) Today Mesannipadda is a well-known historical personality thanks to the splendid results of the Ur excavations.

Perhaps the most valuable contribution of modern archaeological research is the establishment of the essentially dynamic character of early civilizations. Neolithic man may have lived in Egypt, Crete, or in Elam, in comparative isolation from other cultural provinces. But with the introduction of copper the tempo of life was powerfully accelerated.[3] The attainments of the first aeneolithic civilizations do not remain confined to the regions of their originators. Thus the painted pottery of the so-called First Style of Susa is also represented in Mesopotamia and in eastern Persia. The First Minoan civilization reflects Syrian and Mesopotamian improvements. Early contacts between Sumer and Egypt can now hardly be denied by anyone. Migrations due to climatic conditions, wars, trade connections, all of these contributed to a more or less intimate interrelationship between the various members of the ancient world at the beginning of the Copper Age.

If we are, therefore, to gain an insight into conditions at the very beginning of history, we must attempt to differentiate, as clearly as it is possible at the present state of our knowledge, between the individual cultural groups. For the foundations laid in those early days appear to have persisted, in most cases, long into later, one might say modern, times. New elements make their appearance, especially in the second millennium; some of the old factors disappear from the scene. But the effect, the contributions, of those pioneering days are clearly distinguishable in the later settings, regardless of the unceasing ethnic changes and political realignments.

---

[2] A popular account of the radical enlargement of the historical horizon in recent years is given by V. Gordon Childe in his book on *The Most Ancient East* (New York, 1929). Childe is not a specialist on this particular subject, but his summary of the latest archaeological results provides a useful introduction to a very extensive field of study.

[3] On the revolutionary effect which the coming of copper had upon the earliest civilizations, see the admirable account of Frankfort in his *Studies in Early Pottery of the Near East* II 5 ff (London, 1927).

Before the discussion is continued, a few words may be in place with regard to cultural and linguistic designations. As is well known, names employed to signify a certain linguistic group are also used, often quite indiscriminately, as the terms for related cultures, and even for ethnic connotations. We read about Indo-European languages and peoples, or about Hamitic linguistic and cultural elements. Now it is quite true that a group known to us as the Sumerians spoke a language peculiar to themselves, and possessed a civilization which was in many important details very different from that, let us say, of the Egyptians. Furthermore, to judge from Sumerian monuments, the physical characteristics of the people marked them often as different from their various neighbors. We hear therefore about the Sumerian language, as well as of the culture and race of the Sumerians. In the strictest sense of the term, however, only the first usage is tenable: the morphological characteristics of the Sumerian speech are sufficiently distinct to mark it from unrelated linguistic groups, like Akkadian or Elamite. But in the case of culture there is no similar clean-cut line of demarcation. It is often impossible to decide whether a given cultural peculiarity of Southern Mesopotamia is due to Akkadians, Sumerians, or Elamites. The question becomes even more complicated when the above three groups are to be differentiated as racial stocks. In the first place, our data about the Sumerians or the Elamites are not complete enough in this respect; moreover, racial intermixture is sure to have played a prominent part in moulding the physical type of the early inhabitants of Sumer. Under these circumstances a uniform terminology is obviously a difficult matter. And it must not be forgotten that in the case of the Sumerians we are dealing with a type whose various characteristics are much more distinctive than those of other ancient groups. In short, absolute homogeneity of language, culture, and race, is virtually impossible in a civilized community that is in touch with the outside world. The three elements mentioned above may often remain concentric, so to speak; they never coincide completely.[4]

If it is necessary, nevertheless, to retain a common designation for the three concepts, it is only in order to avoid greater confusion by introducing additional labels. We must, however, understand it quite clearly that terms like "Hamitic," or "Sumerian" are used primarily to denote definitely related linguistic groups; the same names may also be applied more generally to the cultures attested for the speakers of those languages by material and literary remains; and lastly, they can be employed, but only with the greatest circumspection, to refer to special physical characteristics which may be demonstrated as common to the majority of such speakers.[5] These remarks are doubtless obvious to most students of the subject. Still, scientific literature shows many instances where the above distinctions are disregarded, and where these terms are not used with sufficient precision; I may be pardoned, therefore, for dwelling somewhat on such rather elementary details.

---

[4] For definitions of the above terms the reader may be referred to the introductory chapter by J. L. Myres in *Cambridge Ancient History* I (New York, 1924).

[5] See also Frankfort, *Studies* I 72 f.

An ethnic map of the ancient world at a given period of the third millennium, reconstructed and pieced together on the basis of the available sources, would produce the impression of very chaotic conditions. In Mesopotamia we should find the more or less defined Sumerians and Akkadians, probably with an addition of Amorite elements. In the north-east we should encounter the Elamites, the Lullu, and the Guti, together with a host of less distinct mountain tribes. In the north there would be "Assyrians" and Subareans, or Hurrians. Syria and Asia Minor would be represented by a number of West-Semitic and Anatolian groups. Then we should come upon the Egyptians, the Cretans, the people of the mainland of Greece, with numerous branches and subdivisions. Clearly, no adequate picture of the period could be obtained on an ethnic basis. No wonder, then, that works on ancient history have been dealing, instead, in terms of culture.

Here the sectional division produces more clarity. We speak of the cultures of Egypt, Mesopotamia, and of the Aegean section. The linguistic correspondents for the first two give us Hamitic and Semitic, and the added advantage of this terminology is that Libya, the Sinaitic peninsula, Palestine, and Syria, are also included in such general connotations. Another step gives us the Hamitic and Semitic types which, as anthropologists tell us, are representative of the Mediterranean race. The Aegean section, on the other hand, must remain ill-defined, as there is no single well-known linguistic family that may be definitely connected with the material culture of the district. As for the Elamites and the various other Mesopotamian outsiders (including eastern Anatolia and Armenia), they have been doomed to remain unclassifiable, since they do not boast the comparative cultural unity of the Aegean. The Sumerians are a group apart, and the Indo-Europeans, who become prominent in the second millennium,[6] are taken care of rather well. Their linguistic affiliations are well known, and the dominant racial type of the group is connected by anthropologists with the Nordic element.[7]

With the better defined groups, such as the Hamites, Semites, Sumerians, and Indo-Europeans, out of the way, we are still confronted with a long and continuous chain of peoples, that extends from Elam, through Upper Mesopotamia and Anatolia, into the Aegean lands and beyond; these peoples and tribes are as yet in need of further identification. The problem is one of great interest and of considerable importance, and it has occupied the minds of numerous scholars since the end of the past century. Their researches, carried on often independently and from several different angles, have served to shed a great deal of light upon the question, and have made it possible to combine the numerous elements scattered along this wide belt into several interconnected groups.

The first approach to the problem was on a philological basis. The study was taken up simultaneously at both ends of the line, in the Aegean and in Elam, although neither group realized at first that there might be the remotest connection between the two termini. The starting point at the western end was a closer scrutiny of the pre-Grecian place names in the Aegean region. In the eastern terminus attention turned to the second column of the Achaemenid trilingual inscriptions, which was later to be identified as Elamite. It is an interesting coincidence that the first reliable results in both fields were published in the same year, 1896. P. Kretschmer's *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache* demonstrated beyond the possibility of dispute that the greater part of the Aegean toponymic material, for which there are no satisfactory Greek or Indo-European etymologies, had plausible analoga in Anatolian place names. Heinrich Winkler, on the other hand, suggested, in his study of the Elamite inscriptions, the theory that the language in question had elements in common with the large linguistic group that is represented primarily in the Caucasus area and is referred to as the "Caucasian" family of languages.[8] Both views have since been further elaborated, and to a certain extent modified. The study of the Aegean and Anatolian connections has been continued among others by Fick[9] and Sundwall;[10] in the Elamite field, in which the patient labor of P. Scheil[11] has considerably enriched the inscriptional apparatus, further progress has been noted, thanks to the studies of men like Hüsing,[12] Bork,[13] and König.[14]

---

[6] On the possibility of the appearance of the so-called proto-Indo-Europeans in the third millennium, see below.

[7] For a discussion of the white races of man see Myres, *CAH* I 28 ff., and W. H. Worrell, *A Study of Races in the Ancient Near East* (Cambridge, 1927).

---

[8] Cf. Heinrich Winkler, *Die Sprache der zweiten Columne der dreisprachigen Inschriften und das Altaische* (Breslau, 1896).

[9] August Fick, *Vorgriechische Ortsnamen als Quelle für die Vorgeschichte Griechenlands* (Göttingen, 1905); *Hattiden und Danubier in Griechenland* (Göttingen, 1909). Both monographs are now antiquated in view of the decipherment of the archives of Boghazkoi and the consequent modification of the term "Hittite."

[10] Joh. Sundwall, *Die einheimischen Namen der Lykier nebst einem Verzeichnisse kleinasiatischer Namenstämme* (Leipzig, 1913). The author's attempt to connect all Anatolian names known from Greek sources with Lycian tribes is certainly unjustified. Cf. also P. Kretschmer, "Der Name der Lykier und andere kleinasiatische Völkernamen," *Kleinasiatische Forschungen* I (1927) 1–18, and F. Bork, *Skizze des Lükischen* (Leipzig, 1926).

[11] Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse, vv. II, III, V, VI, X, XI, XVII.

[12] For more than thirty years Hüsing has been contributing to the scientific periodicals numerous articles on Elamite. Of his monographs may be mentioned, *Die Sprache Elams* (Breslau 1908); "Die elamische Sprachforschung," *Memnon* IV (1910), pp. 5–40; *Die einheimischen Quellen zur Geschichte Elams* (Leipzig, 1916); cf. also his study eneitled "Der Zagros und seine Völker," *Der Alte Orient* (*AO*) IX (1908), nos. 3–4. Hüsing's work is invariably stimulating even if it often fails to prove convincing. For a deeper understanding of the intricate problems of Elamite philology Hüsing's publications are of greatest importance.

[13] Cf. the bibliography in Hüsing's *Quellen*, 37 f., and the article "Elam B

Since the beginning of the present century new avenues have been opened for the study of the eastern as well as the western part of the "unidentified belt." In both cases it is the cuneiform records that have helped to swell the available sources. On the one hand we see the appearance of new linguistic units such as the Hurri-Mitanni, and the Haldian or Vannic. It is very significant that both these languages have disclosed affinities with some of the modern Caucasian tongues.[15] On the other side of the line, the most notable achievement has been, of course, the decipherment of the records found in the archives of Boghazkoi. They are composed in several languages, thus bearing eloquent witness to the existence of a variety of linguistic and ethnic elements in ancient Anatolia.[16] But if we disregard the Akkadian and Sumerian influences, which naturally followed the adoption of the cuneiform script, and if we further eliminate the superimposed Indo-European elements, the two main ethnic stocks that can be postulated for central and eastern Anatolia on the basis of the new inscriptional evidence, prove to be proto-Hittite and Hurrian. Here we have clearly a bridge between the East and the West. The Hurrians are known to have penetrated into the region east of the Tigris, and even into Sumer, not to mention Syria and Palestine;[17] the proto-Hittites gravitate more definitely towards the West and link up with Aegean elements. At the same time, cognate features have been recognized in both groups. Even if we are not as yet in a

---

(Sprache)" which Bork has contributed to the *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte* (*RV*) III (1925), pp. 70–83.

[14] Fr. W. König, *Drei altelamische Stelen* (Leipzig, 1925): König is also the editor of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Elamicarum* (Hannover, 1926 ff.).

[15] Cf. ch. V. and VI.

[16] See Forrer, "Die Inschriften und Sprachen des Ḫatti-Reiches," *ZDMG* LXXVI (1922) 174–269, and Hrozný "Über die Völker und Sprachen des alten Chatti-Reiches," *Boghazkoi Studien* V (1920).

[17] For further details cf. ch. V.

position to prove a genetic relationship between proto-Hittite and Hurrian, we must assume very extensive interpenetration. Linguistic evidence has thus helped to illuminate very markedly the long road from Elam to the Aegean, and further westwards. Even a scholar of Kretschmer's reputation has suggested connections between Elam and Sicily, on purely philological grounds.[18] For the present, however, judicious scepticism is absolutely essential for the sober evaluation of the ancient linguistic material, which has been so suddenly and substantially augmented. Our studies in this field are still in an embryonic state, and mature judgment must await a more thorough sifting of the available data. In the meantime we must look to other quarters for further light on the subject.

We have seen that our ancient sources point to the Caucasus as the probable center of their modern analogues. It is relevant, therefore, to inquire what aid and encouragement may be expected from that side. For if Caucasian philology could furnish results that tally with those of the Hurro-Elamite and Aegeo-Anatolian disciplines, the chain of evidence would be practically complete for a positive identification of this enormous ancient group. Unfortunately, conditions are not yet favorable for such an ideal solution.

Before presenting the Caucasian side, I should like to sum up the reasons why the Caucasian claims are bound to meet with a warm reception on the part of scholars. The main families of languages now spoken by members of the white race are, as is well known, the Hamito-Semitic and the Indo-European, together with a third group usually listed as "Caucasian." Hamito-Semitic is connected by anthropologists with the Mediterranean branch of the white race, while Indo-European is derived from an originally Nordic center.[19] The remaining group of pure whites is generally designated as Alpine. Now a large portion of the Alpine stock is notable for its hypo-brachycephalic skulls; to that group the term "Armenoid" is almost universally applied. Incidentally, the people with abnormally short skulls are found primarily in Armenia, as the name implies, and also in the Caucasus and in Anatolia.[20] According to a recent theory, the entire Alpine branch is said to have originated in the Armenian highlands.[21]

---

[18] P. Kretschmer, "Die protoindogermanische Schicht," *Glotta* XIV (1925 pp. 300–319. Cf. especially p. 319, n. 1, where attention is called to the fact that the Sicilian port Λιλύβη lay near to the territories of the Elymites (''Ελυμοι or 'Ελυμαῖοι) and that the two names recall the Asiatic Elamites and Lullubi. These parallels are indeed striking, but I doubt whether they are due to anything more than coincidence. For Elam was only the Semitic and not the native name for the country north-east of Sumer, and it is improbable that the Sicilian Elymites were indebted for their own name to Semitic sources. Cf. ch. II.

The hypothesis that Aegean-Elamite elements have survived among the modern Caucasians would thus solve with one stroke the whole problem of the "unidentified belt." Corresponding to the Hamito-Semitic Mediterraneans, and the Indo-European Nordics, we should have a third group of Caucasian Alpines, which is to include, according to the advocates of this view, not only the Aegeans, Anatolians, Elamites, Hurrians, Haldians, and their various relatives, but also the Philistines, Etruscans, Iberians, Ligurians, Basques, etc. In short, any doubtful European or Near-Eastern white becomes automatically Caucasoid. The symmetrical juxtaposition of racial and linguistic divisions is in this manner beautifully established.

I have outlined briefly this all-embracing panacea not with a view to ridiculing it, but in order to warn against its alluring plausibility. On the face of it, the connection between the ancient Aegeans and eastern highlanders, with the modern Caucasians, is not only possible but even highly probable. One might add also the ethnological argument based upon the occurrence of Armenoid types on Hittite and north Syrian monuments, and further deduced from the finding of some hypo-brachycephalic skulls in Mesopotamia,[22] and even in Egypt.[23] But all of this does not entitle us to claim that the relationship in question has been established satisfactorily on philological grounds. For this an entirely different set of evidence is required, and such evidence has not yet been presented. In fact, it cannot be adduced for a long time to come, owing to the present status of Caucasian philology.

---

[19] This does not imply, of course, that all the peoples that use Indo-European languages are members of the Nordic branch, but merely that the Indo-European speech originated with the so-called Nordics. However, racial groupings are exceedingly uncertain, as may be gathered from the fact that the physical anthropologists themselves are not in accord with one another as regards such classifications. Cf. *CAH* I 28 ff.

[20] Cf. F. v. Luschan, *Voelker, Rassen, Sprachen*, 55 ff. (Berlin, 1922).

[21] J. L. Myres, *CAH* I 62.

When one first examines the term "Caucasian languages," one naturally expects to find here a group of interrelated members comparable to Semitic or Indo-European. This impression is not borne out upon further examination. The Caucasus is a district where, within a comparatively small area, several dozens of languages are used. After the Indo-European and Turco-Tartar dialects have been eliminated, there still remains an alarmingly large number of speech-units that require classification. To add to the existing difficulties, few of those languages possess written records, and these do not go back more than a few centuries. For many individual members of the group, grammars and glossaries are available, thanks to the industry of several Russian scholars. But the work is very uneven in value, and a good many dialects are still imperfectly recorded. Under these circumstances, a comparative grammar of the Caucasian languages that shall be on the scientific level of similar Indo-European or Semitic works, is for the present hardly possible. As a matter of fact, we had to wait until the year 1928 before the less ambitious, but most urgently needed, introduction to the subject of Caucasian languages could be produced. Now that we have Adolf Dirr's excellent *Einführung in das Studium der kaukasischen Sprachen*,[24] we can realize how far Caucasian philology must still travel before it becomes a reliable guide for the student of comparative philology, not to say for the purpose of ethnological deductions.

---

[22] Cf. Langdon, *Excavations at Kish* (Paris, 1924), p. 64, and the appendix by Buxton, *ib.* 124.

[23] *CAH* I 244 ff. The "Caucasian" origin of the Egyptians is claimed by Petrie, *Ancient Egypt*, 1926, 41 ff.

Dirr finds among the Caucasian languages three large and distinct groups: the southwestern, which includes Georgian; the northwestern, which comprises Circassian; and lastly, the northeastern group centered around the Caspian Sea. These three divisions, we are told, may ultimately prove to be genetically related; for the present they must be kept strictly apart.[25]

It is obvious from the preceding that, from the point of view of a philologist, the term "Caucasian languages" is not much more illuminating than "Asiatic languages," or the like. If the three Caucasian stocks should ever prove descended from a single source, the phonetic system of proto-Caucasian will have to be abstracted, and only then shall we be justified in comparing a given ancient language, or remnants thereof, with the Caucasian group as a whole. Whether this shall ever be cannot be decided before many more years of intensive work have been devoted to the subject.

I would not attempt to minimize the importance of the studies in which Elamite or Hurrian have been plausibly connected with individual Caucasian languages. It is perfectly possible to demonstrate that the structural principles of Elamite morphology have no satisfactory parallels in Semitic or in Indo-European, but that they resemble in this respect one of the known Caucasian groups. Somewhat similarly, Sumerian is demonstrably agglutinative, and it matters very little that its relatives are yet to be discovered among the other agglutinative tongues. But it is an altogether different matter to single out a word or two from some modern Caucasian speech-center in order to compare it triumphantly with random words scattered all over Europe and Hither Asia, building on this slender structure weighty ethnic and racial theories. Yet this is precisely what the more exuberant pan-Caucasianists have been doing in recent years.[26]

---

[24] For further bibliography cf. pp. 379–380 of the above work.

[25] *Ib.* pp. 1 ff.

This is an important distinction and it cannot be emphasized too strongly. An example will perhaps serve to bring out the point more clearly. The most extreme advocate of the pan-Caucasian school is undoubtedly the Russo-Georgian scholar Nicholas Marr. His conclusions have been summed up in a pamphlet, which is now available in a German translation under the title: *Der japhetitische Kaukasus und das dritte ethnische Element im Bildungsprozess der mittelländischen Kultur*.[27] The title speaks for itself, and the general thesis is probable enough, as we have seen. But it is Marr's method that no trained scholar can possibly take seriously. The author starts with the assumption that Semitic and Caucasian (which he calls Japhethite) are related. To establish this theory he has devised a set of very obscure phonetic rules. So obliging is his phonetic system that by the simple expedient of the application of these rules, he proves to his own complete satisfaction that the names for Philistines, Crete, Corsica, Sardinia, Pyr(h)enees, Britain, Etruscans and Pelasgians, have all the same element (*rt*) in common.[28] It follows that the Caucasians had much to do with all of the above peoples and countries. Little further comment is required. If we had proto-Caucasian and proto-Semitic to operate with, one could perhaps understand this fanciful flight of a man with a highly speculative turn of mind. As it happens, we do not even know that the Caucasian groups themselves are at all related. Marr's work is likely to prejudice students rather than to gain adherents. If the Caucasian hypotheses still retain their attractiveness, it is in spite of their most radical advocates, and not because of them.[29]

---

[26] Cf. e.g., the article by A. Wirth entitled "Kasische Forschungen," in *Memnon* III (1909–10), pp. 1–48. A sounder view is taken by Th. Kluge, *ib.*, 169 ff.

[27] Published in Berlin, 1923.

[28] *Ib.*, pp. 16 f.

The one useful contribution that Marr has made in his theorizing is the introduction of a serviceable name. It will have become evident by this time that every general reference to the linguistic and ethnic elements under consideration is made cumbersome because of the lack of a convenient and universally understood label. Our "unidentified belt" has been bad enough. Scholars have tried to get around the difficulty by introducing a number of new terms, or by modifying some old ones; they have all had little success. Thus Hommel's "Alarodians" is based on the Greek rendering of *Urarṭu*, or Armenia,[30] and is properly applicable to but one people out of so many. "Armenoids" suffers from the same shortcoming, though it may be useful as a racial term. "Aegean," "Anatolian," "Elamite," etc. also substitute a part for the whole. "Highlanders" commits us to placing the scene of our investigations in mountainous zones, and this is not always justified by the facts.[31] The name which has perhaps the greatest vogue is "Caucasian." But upon examination it proves equally inadequate. In the first place, it is a definite and restricted geographical term, scarcely applicable to Mesopotamia or to Crete. Moreover, it is already monopolized for an entirely different purpose, being employed to designate, however incorrectly, the entire white race. Even Caucasian philologians in the restricted sense of the term have found it necessary to introduce a further distinction by apocopating the word into Casite;[32] this on the other hand, might get us in trouble with the Mesopotamian Kassites. Clearly, a useful name is not to be found among any of those listed above.

---

[29] It may be that I have expressed myself too strongly on this point. That Marr is a scholar with vision and foresight can hardly be denied. His tireless industry has gained for him the admiration of his associates and his students. According to Tseretheli (*JRAS*, 1916: p. 57) Marr has correctly appraised the non-Indo-European elements in modern Armenian. Cf. also R. Bleichsteiner, "Kaukasische Sprachen," *RV* VI, 261. He has also made important contributions to the study of Haldian, though his transliteration and translation of the latter have not met with the approval of other students of Haldian; cf. Tseretheli, *Die neuen ḫaldischen Inschriften des Königs Sardurs von Urarṭu* (Heidelberg, 1928), p. III. The fact remains, however, that Marr's method is unscientific, and that his conclusions are strongly influenced by his beliefs rather than by his results. See Dirr, *Einführung*, p. VI.

[30] Fr. Hommel, *Ethnologie und Geographie des Alten Orients* (Munich, 1926), pp. 7, 512. It may be added in this connection that Hommel was one of the first to appreciate the importance of the "Caucasian" languages for the ancient history of the Near East (cf. *o.c.*, p. 34). His *Ethnologie* is a stupendous work

Marr seems to have solved the problem satisfactorily by reviving the Biblical Japheth. Sem and Ham have been in the harness for a long time, and the third brother can also be of service. We need not of course adhere to the division given

---

in which the old master has collected an enormous amount of valuable information. Unfortunately, however, Hommel is often fond of suggesting etymologies that have little regard for phonetic laws. In spite of this drawback the *Ethnologie* is a very useful work.

[31] For the "Highland Zone" see *CAH* I 57 ff. Frankfort (*Antiquaries Journal* VIII (1928) 217 ff.) uses the term "Highland Culture" for the First Civilization of Susa. Curiously enough, the old Sumerians also applied to Elam the term "Highland" (*NIM*). If used in a wider sense, however, this designation is likely to cause confusion. For in the first place, not all members of that group occupied the hill-country in historical times. In the second place, Frankfort would apply to the civilization related to Susa II the term "Lowland Culture;" since the bearers of this latter culture are ethnically related to the people of Susa I, as will be shown below, the separation of the two by means of different names would also be misleading.

[32] Wirth, *Memnon* III 1 ff.

in the table of nations as listed in Genesis X. The Semites and Hamites of modern scholarship do not correspond at all with the Biblical classifications.[33] The Indo-Europeans are a well established group, and no confusion need be feared from that quarter. "Japhetic" would then be inclusive of all the elements hitherto considered, which are not already placed with the Hamites, Semites, Indo-Europeans, or with any other well-defined group such as the Altaic, Dravidian, and the like. The name need not be committal geographically, linguistically, or in any other way; its main value would lie in the fact that it is indefinite and flexible; its sense would be primarily negative, as the term would designate elements not located elsewhere. I am not unaware of the objections that may be raised against it. But this is no less true of other similar designations. We hardly ever stop to consider how clumsy, and altogether inexact "Indo-European" happens to be, not to mention "Indo-Germanic."[34] On the whole, the term "Japhetic" or "Japhethite" appears to be preferable to any other name hitherto proposed. For more definite specifications we can use *Eastern Japhethite* in dealing with Mesopotamia and Elam, *Western Japhethite* in connection with Anatolia and the Aegean, and the like. But it must be understood clearly that, for the time being at least, no genetic relationship can be implied by these designations.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that in a study of ethnic relationships premature assumptions are more likely to retard the progress of the work rather than to advance it. This is especially true of the purely philological part of the inquiry. Unfortunately, scholars have not always been careful enough to guard against the pitfalls that lurk behind hasty conclusions. It is certainly strange to find in the work of a linguist like Trombetti misleading statements, which are likely to produce the impression of well ascertained results where only the surface has really been skimmed. This is what Trombetti has to say in his *Elementi di Glottologia*[35] with regard to the further relations of the "Caucasian" languages: "The latest studies have tended to demonstrate that with the original Caucasian group the following languages, which I shall place in three classes, are more or less directly connected:

---

[33] As is well known, according to the classification of Genesis, we should have to consider as Hamites the Canaanites, the Hittites, and even Nimrod who is introduced as a Mesopotamian hero. On the other hand, the Elamites are listed among descendants of Shem. Philology has therefore borrowed the names only, while largely disregarding the ethnic data.

[34] With the discovery of the Tocharian branch, even the geographic significance of the name "Indo-European" ceased to be adequate.

I. 1. Haldian or Vannic (proto-Armenian). 2. Mitanni. 3. Elamite, and Kassite or Caspian. 4. Hittite and Arzawa.

II. 1. The languages that are original with Asia Minor (Lycian, Lydian, Carian, Mysian, and in addition, Pisidian, Isaurian, Lycaonian, and Cappadocian). 2. Etruscan and Lemnian. 3. Cretan.

III. Iberian and Basque.

All the above languages are extinct with the exception of Basque. For those of the first group we have documents in cuneiform characters, for Hittite also is a local hieroglyphic script."[36]

I do not feel that this classification calls for many comments. The wholesale comparison with an allegedly uniform group of modern Caucasian languages is, as we have seen, wholly unwarranted. The grouping suffers from a deplorable lack of precision. "Hittite" is apparently meant to comprise such markedly diversified dialects as the Japhetic Hattic or proto-Hittite, as well as the radically Indo-Europeanized speech of the later Hittite empire.[37] Misleading is also Trombetti's attempt to dismiss the numerous dialects of Anatolia, as recorded in classical sources, with the statement that they are indigenous to Asia Minor. It has been shown that several of them have demonstrable proto-Indo-European affinities which Trombetti himself notes;[38] until we are sure of the component elements, we must beware of conclusions that give the impression of finality. And need I call attention to the fact that the inscriptions of the Aegean section proper still remain a tantalizing puzzle? I have dwelt long enough on linguistic considerations. It must be evident to the unprejudiced student that philology alone will not solve, for the time being at least, the various and highly complicated ethnic and cultural problems that arise from the study of the ancient Japhethites.

---

[35] A. Trombetti, *Elementi di Glottologia* 134 (Bologna, 1922).

[36] For a scholarly and sober review of the languages of Asia Minor see the article of Joh. Friedrich entitled "Altkleinasiatische Sprachen," *RV* I 126–142. Cf. also the resumé of V. Christian in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* (*RLA*), "Altkleinasiatische Völker," pp. 76–88.

Nor is archaeology able to do it with the material now at its disposal. Ancient remains, when tolerably abundant and complete, may enable us to reconstruct a picture of the times to which these remains belong. But we cannot forget that culture, race, and language, are by no means identical subjects. Archaeology becomes of decisive significance for ethnological purposes only when it can be linked satisfactorily with philological data; then the independent results of the two disciplines become mutually corroborative, and the validity of the concerted evidence is thus greatly enhanced.

---

[37] There has been considerable difficulty in determining the name by which "Hittite" was really known. Forrer has suggested the term "Kaneshite," after the old Cappadocian city of Kanesh. His reasons for introducing this term have not been found convincing. On the other hand, Hrozný has recently shown that the adjective *naši-li*, which was applied to the official language of Boghazkoi, was really connected with the name of the city *Nēšaš*; he has therefore suggested for the Indo-European Hittites the general designation "Neshi-tes" cf. *Archiv Orientální* I 295. The Indo-European affiliations of "Hittite" are discussed by E. H. Sturtevant in his article "On the Position of Hittite among the Indo-European Languages," published in *Language* II 25–34. The author reaches the conclusion that Hittite was not a descendant but a sister language of proto-Indo-European, a view which was already indicated by Forrer in *MDOG* 61 (1921) 26. Cf. also the afore-mentioned article of Kretschmer (see note 18). Sturtevant makes in his publication the important point that the usually accepted division of the Indo-European groups into *centum* and *satem*-languages is inexact, and that its application to Hittite is peculiarly inept (*l.c.* 29).

[38] See especially Kretschmer, *l.c.*, and the same author's "Das *nt*-Suffix," *ib.*, 84–106.

To what extent do archaeological results from the Japhetic areas affect and supplement the linguistic data heretofore reviewed? The answer to that question need not detain us very long. Researches of scholars like de Morgan,[39] Pottier,[40] Rostovtzeff,[41] Matz,[42] and Frankfort,[43] to mention only the latest authorities, have provided us with the means to view the ample material from the angle of comparative archaeology. I may limit myself, therefore, to a very brief summary, reserving several important details for the subsequent chapters of this study.

Very reassuring in this connection is the fact that we have in the area under discussion a comparatively restricted group of cultures as against a large number of languages and dialects. On the other hand, the individuality of a given linguistic unit can be determined with greater precision than the dividing line between cultural groups; the latter shade off frequently the one into the other, and the results are necessarily less decisive. With these general reservations in mind, we may proceed to a brief review of the relationship to our problem of the civilizations named after such centers as Susa I and II, Syria, Anatolia, and the Aegean with its subdivisions in Crete and on the mainland of Greece.

---

[39] J. de Morgan, *Les premières civilisations* (Paris, 1909), and his posthumous work *La préhistoire Orientale* (Paris, 1925–27).

[40] E. Pottier, *Céramique peinte de Suse et petits monumnents* (*MDEP*, XIII), and "Une théorie nouvelle sur les vases des Susa," *Revue Archéologique* XXIII (1926) 1–39.

[41] M. Rostovtzeff, *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia* (Oxford, 1922), and "The Sumerian Treasure of Astrabad," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* VI (1920) 1–27.

[42] *Studies*, vs. I–II, and *Antiquaries Journal VIII* 217–235.

[43] F. Matz, *Die frühkretischen Siegel* (Berlin, 1928).

To start with the easternmost and probably oldest of these civilizations, Susa I is represented as early as the end of the fourth millennium over a wide area extending from the Habur, a tributary of the Euphrates, across Mesopotamia and Elam, as far east as Baluchistan. The most characteristic product of this civilization is a special type of painted pottery, decorated with geometric motives combined with highly stylized representations of naturalistic types. Among the objects that make their appearance in this culture may be mentioned primtive implements of copper as well as the earliest known stamp-seals.[44]

In the Elamite capital the civilization of Susa I gave way to a later culture, commonly designated as Susa II. The earlier abstract style changes into a pronounced realistic one; a polychrome color-scheme is in vogue, theriomorph and compartment vases appear for the first time, and by the side of the stamp-seal we begin to get cylinder seals. During the course of this civilization the Elamite pictographic script is introduced. This style does not seem to have extended further east, but it has numerous congeners in the west. In Mesopotamia we find it represented in the region of Kish, also in conjunction with a pictographic script. With the aid of the theriomorph vases and the polychrome decoration we can trace it to Syria and even to Palestine, while Anatolia displays many related features. The division between the earlier and the later styles is not everywhere marked as clearly, in point of time at least, as it is in Susa.[45]

The expansion of these early types of painted pottery corresponds remarkably well with the distribution of the eastern

---

[44] Frankfort, *Studies* I chs. II and III.

[45] For further details cf. ch. III.

Japhethites deduced tentatively on philological grounds. The traces point to Anatolia where they become less distinct among the varieties of typically local wares.[46] But here other threads may be picked up, which lead us ultimately into the Aegean. For in Crete, Cyprus, and even in the mainland of Greece, we find definite Anatolian affinities interposed between local neolithic deposits on the one hand, and the later ware with spiral decoration that is also characteristic for other sections of Europe.[47] It has been suggested among others that the neolithic pottery of the Aegean should be assigned to an early Mediterranean population, while the third stratum is probably due to the proto-Indo-Europeans.[48] The middle layer with its Anatolian orientation is connected with the Alpine stock. In other words, the succession of ethnic groups in that area would thus be: Hamitic (or the like), Japhethite, and Indo-European, primarily in the cultural sense of these terms.

The above presentation has been extremely schematic, for which I must apologize, pleading as my excuse the desire not to have the forest obscured by the trees. My main purpose has been to indicate the lines of reasoning whereby the racial deductions have been obtained from the archaeological data; for further details I must refer the reader to the afore-mentioned authorities.

---

[46] Frankfort, *Studies* II ch. III.

[47] *Ib.*, chs. II and IV.

[48] Matz, *o.c.* 263 f. That in the second half of the third millennium the mainland of Greece and the Aegean islands were dependent upon Anatolia has been pointed out by J. B. Haley and C. W. Blegen in their article entitled "The coming of the Greeks," *American Journal of Archaeology,* XXXII (1928) 141–154. The difficult problem of the Achaeans has been admirably discussed in the same journal (XXXIII 206–218) by W. K. Prentice. His conclusion is that the Achaeans were not Greek at all, and that they came to Greece from southern Asia Minor. This may help to clarify the very controversial question as to whether the Greeks are mentioned in the Boghazkoi records, according to the theory of Forrer. The latter has attempted to silence his numerous critics with an article, which has recently appeared in the *Kleinasiatische Forschungen* I (1929) 252 ff. (1929) under the title "Für die Griechen in den Boghazkoi Inschriften." A convenient résumé of the Aegeo-Hittite problems is given by S. Przeworski in *Les problèmes Mycéniens et les textes Hittites* (reprinted from *Eos* XXVIII, Lemberg 1925). Valuable is also the same author's *Studja nad osiadnictwem i rolą Hetytów w środkowej Anatolji* (Warsaw, 1929).

On comparing the evidence of the linguistic sources with the results of archaeological researches, we find that the conclusions tally admirably. Corresponding to the eastern and western Japhethites as deduced on philological grounds, we find an eastern and a western cultural center disclosed from material remains. In both instances Anatolia is the meeting place; and in both cases we are still in need of further proof of a closer relationship between the two groups. Just as the Caucasian languages are said to form the apex in a philological triangle, claims are made that the Caucasian region may hold the clue to important archaeological problems. Related civilizations have been discovered in the Kuban valley,[49] and the introduction of metallurgy, the most powerful single element in the rise of proto-historic cultures, is frequently traced back to Caucasian sources.[50] The promise is now doubly alluring, owing to the combined indications of the two independent lines of study. But again a note of warning against overconfidence is strictly in place.

The archaeological deductions which I have sketched above are plausible but not definite. For one, there is here no universal agreement among scholars. The work of Frankfort, who has painted an intensely fascinating picture of early interrelations, has met with severe criticism in several quarters.[51] But even if we assume that Frankfort's main results will stand the test of future investigations, the gaps in the picture are still numerous and often of a serious nature. The comparative study has barely begun, and the expeditions which are in the field at present are bound to introduce important modifications into our present theoretical structures. As for the agreement of the linguistic and archaeological data, the two bodies of evidence are at best parallel only; to work out their precise interconnection and synchronism is still an unaccomplished task. This must be done separately in the several departments of the large field;[52] it is a matter of many years of minute and painstaking work, an undertaking in which archaeology and philology must go hand in hand.[53]

---

[49] Cf. the works of Rostovtzeff mentioned above.

[50] Frankfort, *Antiqu. J.* VIII. 233 f.

[51] Cf. Pottier, *RAR* XXIII. 1–39, and v. Bissing, Archiv für Orientforschung V (1929). 49–81.

---

[52] G. Glotz, in his *La Civilisation Égéenne* has collected a number of words which though found both in Greek and in the Semitic languages do not have, he asserts, a satisfactory etymology in either family. Consequently, Glotz considers those words as originally Aegean, and this view is probably correct in a number of instances (cf. p. 441 of his book). Some of the words in question, however, are obviously good Akkadian; but I cannot go here into details. The subject is discussed by Ch. Autran in an article entitled "De quelques vestiges probables, méconnus jusqu'ici, du lexique méditerranéen dans le sémitique d'Asie Mineure, et notamment, de Canaan," *Journal Asiatique* 1926: 1–79. But Autran's results are extremely doubtful; a number of his words have quite satisfactory Indo-European etymologies, see *OLZ* 1929: 747 ff. On the other hand, it is well known that some pre-Semitic names of Palestine have interesting parallels in the Aegean area. Cf. especially, E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums* (*GA*) I. 2 (4th ed., Stuttgart 1921), §476, and Eberhard Hommel, "Der Name und die Legende des Jordan in altkanaanäischer Zeit," *Journal of the Society of Oriental Research* (*JSOR*) XI (1927) 169 ff.

[53] Archaeological evidence of contacts between the Caucasus and the Aegean has been recently presented by H. R. Hall in an article entitled "The Caucasian Relations of the Peoples of the Sea," *Klio* XXII (1928) 335–344. Hall calls attention to the valuable work of the Russian scholar A. A. Zakharov, who has stressed the importance of a number of copper and bronze statuettes from the Caucasus, which link up with similar objects from southern Europe. They bear remarkable resemblance to bronze-figures of warriors found in Sardinia, and they share with them the same horned helmets which the Egyptians represented as characteristic of the *Shardana*. The daggers from the Caucasus also resemble those of the *Shardana*, which in turn connect with Philistine weapons. In summing up Hall says that "the Shardana, who afterwards colonized Sardinia, and the nearly related Philistines and other sea-tribes came originally from the

When these preliminary studies have been sufficiently synthesized in Mesopotamia, Anatolia, in the Caucasus and in the Aegean, it will be possible to define the precise relationship of the oldest non-Semitic, non-Indo-European, and otherwise undefined peoples of the ancient world, who may be included under the common name of Japhethites.

I have tried to describe in the present chapter the general setting in order that the details might appear in their proper historical perspective. In the chapters that follow an attempt has been made to give a connected account of one of the main issues indicated in the preceding pages: the part played by the non-Sumerian and non-Semitic population of Mesopotamia and of the adjoining lands, based on the cuneiform sources and in conjunction with the archaeological data. Current histories of Babylonia and of Assyria have not given the subject the amount of attention it deserves; and since they regard the problem from without rather than from within, many valuable indications have been overlooked and lost. Furthermore, our epigraphic and archaeological material has been enormously enriched by the most recent excavations in Mesopotamia; this fact alone should make a re-examination

---

Caucasian region." The famous Phaistos disk, the representations of which seem to connect the Philistines with Anatolia, is considered by Hall a document of Lycian origin. Cf. also v. Bissing, "Die Überlieferung über die Shirdani," *WZKM* XXXIV (1927) 230–259. For the Anatolian origin of the Philistines cf. Przeworski, *Studja* 36, n. 154.

In connection with the "Peoples of the Sea," it may be added that while the majority of scholars still upholds the theory that the Etruscans (*Turša*) came from Asia Minor, the connection of the Etruscans with the *Turša*, and the Anatolian origin of the former, have lately been questioned by v. Bissing; cf. *WZKM* XXXV (1928) 177 ff. On the other hand, however, there are numerous philological indications of Etruscan-Anatolian contacts (cf. *CAH* II 400 ff.), not to speak of the rather ambiguous evidence of matriarchal conditions. For traditions of matriarchal systems in both Anatolia and northern Caucasus cf. Rostovtzeff, *Iranians and Greeks*, 34. For Elam see F. W. König, "Mutterrecht und Thronfolge im alten Elam," *Festschrift der Nationalbibliothek Wien* (1926) 529–552.

desirable. Picking up the thread in Elam, we shall be able to follow the peoples in question through the districts of Mesopotamia, all the way to the Mediterranean coast. Particular attention will be paid to the question of the relationship of those peoples to their better known neighbors. Much that is not immediately relevant to this central topic will have to be omitted from the discussion if the main picture is to remain in the foreground. This much I may be allowed to anticipate: when the inquiry has been completed, the results are likely to have considerable bearing upon the problem of the oldest population of the Near East.

CHAPTER II

ELAM AND SUMER IN THE EPIGRAPHICAL SOURCES

THE country to the east of Lower Mesopotamia was known to the Sumerians by the collective designation of NIM, which may be translated as 'Highland.' In Akkadian the name is *Elam-tu* (Heb. ʿelām), and it is altogether probable that the Semitic term is merely a translation from the Sumerian.[1] At any rate, the Elamites applied to themselves an entirely different name, of which the reading is not yet definitely determined, the choice lying between *Ha-pir-ti* and *Ha-tam-ti*.[2] Later Persian sources refer to the district as *Uvāja* (*Hvāja*), from which the Greek Οὔξιοι and the Arabic

---

[1] The etymology of the Akkadian name for Elam is difficult. Poebel (Sumerische Grammatik 64) would derive *Elam* from the Sumerian form (*E*)*NIM* This explanation appears to me very doubtful, particularly since it presupposes too many phonetic changes. For we should have to assume the change of *n* to *l*, the modification of the final vowel, and lastly, the preservation of the initial vowel in the Akkadian form, although it appears to have been lost in Sumerian. The Biblical form עילם shows that the initial vowel was prominent and that it was preceded by a strong guttural sound. For these reasons it is far more probable that the Semitic name was a translation from Sumerian, as *elū* (Heb. עלה) renders adequately the principal meaning of *NIM*. To be sure the ending (*a*)*m* remains to be explained; it may be due to some analogy which has so far escaped us. It is very significant in this connection that the Assyrians themselves appear to have derived *Elam* from *elū*; cf. the inscription of Shamshi-Adad I Rs 4. 7–8 (*AOB* I *Die Inschriften der altassyrischen Könige* I p. 24), where *šar mātim elītim* 'the king of the upper country' evidently refers to the king of Elam. Hüsing (*Zagros* 23) considers it most probable that *Elam* is derived from the Elamite name *Halla*; this view is very far-fetched.

[2] *For Hapirti* cf. the arguments of Hüsing, *Quellen* 89 ff. The reading *Hatamti* was suggested by P. Scheil, *OLZ* 1905: 203, and *MDEP* X 3. *Hapirti* has much in its favor, but it involves the reading *pir* for TA.AM in the Scheil text.

Ḫōzī are apparently derived.[3] It is very tempting to connect the latter names with that of a prominent Elamite district variously rendered in cuneiform sources as *An-ša-an*, *An-za-an*, and *Aš-ša-an*,[4] presupposing some such pronunciation as *Aččan*. From very early times Anshan appears as a rival name for the whole of Elam,[5] and this usage becomes the rule in the Achaemenid period.[6] The connection suggested above has therefore much in its favor, but the phonetic disparity is sufficiently great to warrant our leaving the question as unsettled.

The capital of Elam was Shushan (Susa)[7] and it is from there that the bulk of our sources for the study of the language and the material culture of the country has hitherto been coming. The epigraphic material is twofold: the semi-pictographic inscriptions which take us down as late as the Dynasty of Agade, and the native records composed in the Sumero-Akkadian cuneiform script, which at length supplanted the pictographs. The clue to the decipherment of the language was supplied by the trilingual inscriptions of the Achaemenid rulers, which give the Elamite text in the middle column, between the old Iranian and the Akkadian, or rather neo-Babylonian versions. After initial attempts to connect the language of the second column with Scythian, Median, and even with Dravidian, had failed,[8] the south Caucasian character of Elamite was first indicated by Heinrich Winkler, and the study was further advanced by Hüsing. P. Scheil as-

[3] See E. Meyer, *GA* I 2. 363.

[4] For the various spellings of this name, including An-du-an(ki), see *RLA* I 111 f. *Ma-da* An-du-an(ki) occurs also in the geographical list published by Schroeder in *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenen Inhalts* (*KAV*) 183. 5.

[5] In the date formulae of Ibi-Sin of Ur, *Anshan* interchanges with *NIM* (Elam); cf. *Royal Inscriptions from Ur* (*URI*) nos. 290 and 292.

[6] For the literature on the subject cf. *Revue Biblique*, (*RB*) 1926, 537. Cf. also *URI* 194.1.

[7] Written ideographically INANNA.ERIN(ki).

[8] See Hüsing, *Memnon* IV 5 ff.

sumed the self-sacrificing task of editing the texts discovered by the *Délégation en Perse*, while Weissbach, Hommel, Bork, and König[9] have all made valuable contributions to the subject.

The unusual vitality of the Elamite language is attested by the fact that it was in use for at least four thousand years. The oldest records carry us back to the beginning of the third millennium, but internal evidence will show, as I hope to demonstrate presently, that Elamite elements must be postulated for the fourth millennium as well. In the Achaemenid inscriptions we find a highly simplified branch of the older speech. For our own era the use of Elamite is reported by the Arab geographer Iṣṭaḫri, who flourished at about the middle of the tenth century; according to his testimony the people of Ḫūzistān (as the district came to be known) still spoke Ḫōzī by the side of Persian.[10] The name Ḫōzī is now also applied to the Elamite dialect used in the Achaemenid period.

For our purpose it will not be necessary to give a detailed account of the grammatical structure of the language. Ferdinand Bork has done that ably and concisely in the third volume of the *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte*.[11] Of importance to our inquiry are only the following few facts: In phonology no distinction is made between voiced and voiceless stops. Of the sounds for which the cuneiform script makes no adequate provision, it is necessary to call attention to the one which is variously rendered as *t*, *l*, or even as *tl*.[12] What the exact character of that sound was it is impossible to ascertain at present; but this much is at least certain, that it was common to many other peoples surveyed in this study. Another sound that is not found in Sumerian or in Akkadian is transcribed by Elamite scholars as *č* or *c* (*ts*); it represents either a palatalized velar, or at times perhaps an assibilated dental.[13]

---

[9] For literature cf. Hüsing, *Quellen* 37–38, 40, and Bork, *RV* III 70–83.

[10] Cf. *Bibliotheca geographorum arabicorum*, ed. de Goeje, I. 88f. The *Enzyklopaedie des Islām* (article "Khūzistān" v. II 1059) erroneously connects the Ḫōzi with the Κοσσαιοι (Kassites).

[11] Cf. note 9.

[12] Hüsing, *Quellen*, 91 f.

As far as the structure of the noun is concerned, it will be necessary to note only the endings used in the formation of the singular and of the plural. For the former we have *-k* and *-r*, for the latter *-p*, all of them often written with an overhanging vowel. Thus *sunki-k* means '(a) king,' *sunki-r* 'the king,' and *sunki-p* signifies 'kings.' An abstract noun is formed with the aid of the suffix *-me*; 'kingdom' would be expressed in Elamite by *sunki-me*.[14] There is no distinction of sex, but the difference between person and thing is carefully guarded. Characteristic of Elamite is a peculiar genitive construction,[15] which is encountered also in other Japhethite languages; we need not, however, go into these details. The above points give us sufficient criteria for recognizing related elements in non-Elamite territories, provided, of course, that we have other corroborative evidence for making such comparisons.

Our imperfect knowledge of Elamite, coupled with the rather limited number of available local records, compels us to go into Sumerian and Akkadian sources in an effort to reconstruct the early history of Elam on the basis of the epigraphic material. Fortunately Mesopotamia has yielded a surprisingly large amount of potential information; to make adequate use of the latter will be our immediate task.

The Mesopotamian documentary evidence that bears upon

---

[13] Cf. König, *Drei altelamische Stelen* 18.

[14] Hüsing, *Memnon* IV 9.

[15] Cf. Hüsing, "Zur elamischen Genetivkonstruktion," *OLZ*, VIII (1905) 549–553. This peculiar construction whereby the suffix of the noun is repeated with all its modifying elements (the so-called *genetivus genetivi*) is said to be represented in modern Georgian; cf. Bleichsteiner, *RV* VI 260.

Elam may be subsumed under the following headings: 1. Contemporary history; 2. Tradition; 3. The internal evidence of philology. We first turn to a brief survey of the earlier historical records in which Elam appears.

The first known historical ruler to mention Elam in a contemporary inscription is the energetic Eannatum of Lagash.[16] One of his most effective boasts is to have been the "conqueror of Elam, the wooded mountain."[17] On another occasion we are told that "by Eannatum Elam, the exalted, was cast down; Elam in her mountain was overthrown."[18] The success against the highland power must have been a bright feather in the Lagashite's cap for he never tires of reminding us that "Eannatum Elam, the wondrous mountain, in its entirety overthrew, its burial-mounds he heaped up."[19] This note of triumph need not surprise us; it was not often that an early ruler of Sumer had good news to announce from the northeastern frontier. Of reverses there must have been many, but these were left for later generations to report, when the sting of defeat had been softened by the intervening years.

Eannatum's victory did not have a very prolonged effect. One of his successors has again much trouble with these persistent raiders from the hills.[20] It took a conqueror of the calibre of Sargon of Agade to carry the fight into the enemy's camp. This time the success of the Mesopotamian must have assumed considerable proportions. Sargon calls himself "smiter of Elam and of Barahsi,"[21] for which he has no doubt ample grounds; Barahsi is an oft-mentioned district on the north-western border of Elam.[22] Among the other members of the Elamite coalition are singled out the cities of Bunban, Gunilaha, Awan, and Susa. Nor is Elam able to recover very soon. Sargon's successor Rimush tells us that "he had smitten Elam and Barahsi;" Manishtusu plunders the provinces of Anshan and Shirihum; and Narām-Sin specifies, according to a recently discovered text, that he is master "of the land of Elam, all of it, as far as Barahshe."[23]

---

[16] NIM(ki) is mentioned in the inscription of Lugalannimundu of Adab; Poebel, *Historical and Grammatical Texts* (*HGT*) 75. col. 4; but the authenticity of the text has been doubted, and the mere listing of the name is of little value for historical purposes.

[17] Cf. Barton, *The Royal Inscriptions of Sumer and Akkad* (*RISA*) p. 32, col. 6. 10–12.

[18] *Ib.*, p. 34, col. 6. 6–9.

[19] *Ib.*, p. 36, col. 3. 11–16; p. 40, col. 3. 5–10. For the translation of Ŭ.GA as 'wondrous' see P. Dhorme, *RB* 1926: 536 f.

[20] At the time of Enetarzi the Elamites plunder Lagash; cf. Barton, *RISA* p. 68. col. 2. 1–3.

The blow dealt Elam by the powerful kings of the dynasty of Agade was evidently a telling one. All seems to be quiet on the eastern front for three hundred years, even though Sumer and Akkad are humbled in the meantime by another outsider, the Gutian from the northern hills. But an ultimate revolt is inevitable. Ibi-Sin, the fifth king of the brilliant Third Dynasty of Ur and the last Sumerian ruler of importance, is again called upon to deal with the traditional enemy. Initial successes over the coalition of Susa, Adamdun and Awan, against which he rages "like a storm,"[24] do not forestall the inevitable doom for long; victories over Anshan and Huhnuri have only an ephemeral effect.[25] The kingdom of the plain is soon at the mercy of its rival from the mountains. Ibi-Sin himself is carried off in fetters into Anshan, together with the statue of his patron deity Nannar, the moon-god of Ur.[26]

---

[21] Cf. Poebel, *Historical Texts* (*HT*) p. 185.

[22] In its Sumerian form, MAR.HA.ŠI, the name is found in the above-mentioned text of Lugalannimundu, cf. note 16. *Barahsi* occurs frequently in the inscriptions of the Dynasty of Agade, cf. Poebel, *HT* pp. 197 ff., and especially pp. 233–7. A land *Paraši* is mentioned in Forrer, *Boghazköi Texte in Umschrift* (*BoTU*) II no. 3. 12 which may be identical with *Barahsi*. The location of the latter is discussed by Albright, "A Babylonian geographical treatise on Sargon of Akkad's empire," *JAOS* 45. 230. Cf. also *RB* 1926: 537 f. The name occurs also in *URI* 9.7; 10.9; 274. I. 10; the latter passage is particularly important (cf. the editor's note, p. 73). The so-called omen-texts also mention Sargon's campaign against *Marhaši*; cf. E. F. Weidner, *Festschrift Meissner* (*FM*), 230. And lastly, we may add here for the sake of completeness, that a city by the name *Paharraše* is often mentioned in the Kirkuk texts, and with particular prominence in the letter of Saushshattar, cf. the writer's note in *JAOS* 49. 269 ff; whether *B/Parahsi* and *Paharraše* have much in common cannot be decided as yet.

[23] Cf. *URI* 274, col. 1. 10.

The stage was now set for a ruler of Elamite origin to assume the kingship of Sumer and Akkad. Nor was this event long in coming. Kudur Mabuk, the son of Simti-Shilhak, asserts himself over the Semitic dynasty of Larsa just as the second millennium draws to a close. The eastern invader demonstrates by his wise and considerate acts that he is no mere barbarian from the highlands, and that as a statesman and organizer he has no equals among the princes of his generation. Kudur Mabuk's sons, Warad-Sin and especially Rim-Sin, become the benevolent despots of whom the demoralized land was sorely in need. For the better part of a century the country is at last able to enjoy the blessings of peace, which are reflected in an unprecedented outburst of cultural activity. After a reign of sixty years, Rim-Sin is finally forced to go the way of his predessors, when the aged king succumbs to an even greater one than himself; but the way for Hammurabi's remarkable rule was clearly paved by the able Elamites. Yet the magnificant age of Hammurabi is but a brief interlude of Babylonian independence. Soon the Kassite, a relative of the Susian as we shall see, is at the gate, and he is destined to hold sway over the subjugated country for the long and dreary period of six hundred years.[27]

---

[24] Cf. the date formulae in *URI* 210–211, and the inscription *ib.*, 289. 11–15.

[25] *Ib.*, 290, 292. To the passages in which the occurrence of Huhnuri has hitherto been noted we may now add Chiera, *Sumerian lexical texts* (Chicago 1929) 216, col. 3.7: *hu-hu-nu-ri.*

[26] Cf. the inscription of Gimil-ilishu, *URI* 100. 8–11. The sad fate of Ibi-Sin is commemorated in the omen-texts; cf. Weidner, *FM* 236.

[27] For a comprehensive account of those events see C. J. Gadd, *History and Monuments of Ur* (*HMU*, New York, 1929) 108 ff.

This very hasty résumé of the historical relations in the third millennium between Lower Mesopotamia and Elam is perhaps sufficient to indicate the steadily growing power of the latter. The interesting fact is that the eastern highlanders loom prominently as early as the time of Eannatum, *i.e.*, soon after the very first historical period in Sumer, that of the First Dynasty of Ur. We have not, however, arrived as yet at the beginning of Sumero-Elamite intercourse. With the aid of another set of records it will be possible to ascend to a period that is still higher in the chronological scale. The evidence in this case may be classified as traditional.

When the priests and scholars of Lower Mesopotamia first began to collect information relating to the past, and to preserve it in written form, it is not possible to determine at present. The king lists, at any rate, which have been brought to light in recent years,[28] may be assigned to the end of the third millennium. The time of peace under Rim-Sin was certainly conducive to scholarly labors and many a chronicler must have flourished during the Elamite's reign, in the important centers of the period, Larsa and Nippur. At first modern scholarship regarded these documents with a great deal of scepticism. This attitude was natural since much of the material dealt with mythological personages to whom reigns of fabulous length were invariably assigned. But later publications of better preserved copies of the lists have put the subject in a new light. No longer can we dismiss the records as idle speculations of a theorizing priesthood; in the light of the latest archaeological finds the chronicles appear as

[28] Cf. Poebel, *HGT* nos. 2–5, and *HT* pp. 73 ff; Legrain, *Historical Fragments*, pp. 15–30, and pl. I; most important are the Oxford chronological prisms, Weld-Blundell (W-B.) 444, published by Langdon in *Oxford editions of cuneiform texts* (*OECT*) II pls. I–IV, and *W-B*. 62, *ib*. pl. VI. Among the recent studies of the new lists of kings may be mentioned: P. Dhorme, "L'aurore de l'histoire babylonienne," *RB* 1924; 1926; H. Zimmern, "Die altbabylonischen vor- (und nach-) sintflutlichen Könige nach neuen Quellen," *ZDMG* LXXVIII (1924) 19–35, S. Smith, *History of Assyria* (*HA*, New York, 1927) chs. 2–3.

the sum of the historical knowledge of the period in which they were composed. For most of the third millennium the information is now known to be remarkably accurate, and it is only upon reaching what to us represents the turn of the fourth millennium, that the ancient temple-chronicler begins to confuse myth with fact. For this he can hardly be blamed; in the clearer light and perspective of the present day we find the events of the early dynastic period of Sumer quite as baffling and no less confusing.[29]

Let me cite one concrete example by way of illustration. The king lists name as the third dynasty after the Flood one that resided at Ur for a period of 177 years. Nothing was known until recently about the kings who composed that dynasty, and they would have been, doubtless, regarded by modern scholars as semi-legendary, together with the preceding kings of Erech and of Kish, if it had not been for the remarkable archaeological discoveries made in the last few seasons at Ur. Now we know that a temple at el-Obeid was built to the mother-goddess Nin-khursag by A-anni-padda, the son of Mesannipadda, the founder of the dynasty. From Ur have come cylinder seals of Nin-tur-nin, the wife of Mesannipadda, who first "brought kingship to Ur," according to the testimony of the king lists. So, far from being semi-mythical, the First Dynasty of Ur has now become to us more familiar and substantial than many later periods. Moreover, the so-called proto-dynastic graves at Ur of the time of Mes-kalam-shar and of Shub-ad, assuming that they really antedate the time of Mesannipadda, have yielded finds of such exquisite beauty that the remains of the First Dynasty disclose, on comparison, unmistakable signs of decadence.[30] Thus at the very dawn of history we are confronted in Sumer with an amazing civilization, refined and literate, that is revealed full-grown before our startled eyes. Archaeological discoveries have helped to vindicate to a remarkable extent the scholarship of the old chroniclers. Certainly no one will be now so rash as to deny some historical value to the other passages in the king lists, which contain references to reigns of supernatural duration. The dates may be hopelessly out of focus, but in the succession of reported events later tradition is likely to have preserved information that is evidently sound and credible.

---

[29] The problem of the early chronology of Sumer is still a very complicated one. Until the recent discoveries at Ur the tendency was to put the First Dynasty of Ur far back in the fourth millennium, or even in the fifth. Ungnad (*ZDMG* 1917. 166) placed the beginning of that dynasty at 3927 B.C.; Meissner (*Babylonien und Assyrien* I. 23) at about 3900; Weidner (*MVAG* 1921. 61) at 4148; Legrain (*Historical Fragments* 11) at 4340, Langdon, (*OECT* II 7) at *ca.* 4100. Cf. also Clay, *A Hebrew Deluge Story in Cuneiform* (*YOS* V 3) 42 ff. A discussion of the problem as affected by the latest finds is furnished by Gadd in a chapter which he contributed to the work of Hall and Woolley, *Excavations at Ur, I: Al-ʿUbaid* (London, 1927). A drastic reduction of those dates is advocated by V. Christian and E. F. Weidner, "Das Alter der Gräberfunde aus Ur," *AfO* V. 139 ff.

If we read, therefore, in the lists that the First Dynasty of Ur was displaced after holding sway for 177 years, and that "its kingship passed to Awan,"[31] we have no reason whatever to doubt the main facts, even though we cannot accept as good coin the number of years assigned to the three kings of the new dynasty. Now Awan was, as we have seen above, a province of Elam, being often found as a member of the various coalitions of Elamite states.[32] Philological evidence for the Elamite character of Awan will be adduced below. The historical kernel behind the statement of the king lists is, therefore, that the amazing period of the earliest historical rulers at Ur was brought to an end by an invasion from the north-eastern hills; the confusion that followed may be reflected in the fabulous reigns with which the Elamite rulers from Awan are presented. Order is reestablished with the transfer of power to Kish, whose second dynasty succeeds that of Awan.[33] It is not at all improbable that the well-known ruler of Kish by the name of Mesilim, who is curiously enough not mentioned in the legible part of the king list which deals with the Second Dynasty of Kish,[34] really freed Elam from the yoke of the Elamites. The wars that Eannatum waged against the Elamites were perhaps nothing else than repercussions of the preceding struggles between Awan and Kish.[35]

---

[30] See L. Legrain, "The Boudoir of Queen Shubad," *Museum Journal* 1929. 211 ff., and "Gem Cutters in Ancient Ur," *ib.* 258 ff. The stylistic evidence of the cylinder seals from the proto-dynastic graves at Ur favors an earlier date for the finds in question than is proposed by Christian and Weidner, *l. c.* 147 ff.

[31] Cf. the restoration in *OECT* II p. 13.

[32] Cf. Poebel, *HT* p. 128.

Tradition knows of a still earlier time in which Elam is said to have menaced the fertile lands of Lower Mesopotamia. That immemorial struggle is traced back to the very mythical beginnings of the land. The first dynasty alleged to have ruled after the flood is placed by the native chroniclers at Kish. The semi-divine rulers of the First Dynasty of Kish, each of whom is assigned a reign of truly titanic proportions, have much more of an astrological than of a historical nature.[36] It is therefore all the more interesting that amidst the hazy contours of these shadowy rulers, one is found who is endowed with a distinct and substantial texture. The single reference to an event that occurred during the period of the first post-diluvian dynasty is connected with the twenty-second ruler of that group of kings. Enmenbaragisi,[37] we are told quite unexpectedly, found it advisable to give part of his round nine hundred years of rule to merely earthly considerations, for he was the one "who the land of Elam with his arms subdued."[38] To a later age that was the one occurrence worth listing, out of the altogether astounding period of 24,510 years three months three days and one half day which the first rulers after the flood had to divide among themselves.[39] The annoying detail that interrupted the care-free existence of the demi-gods was the necessity of teaching Elam a lesson. It was singled out as the first political occurrence after the Flood.

---

[33] "Awan by weapons was smitten; its kingship passed to Kish." Cf. *OECT* pl. II col. 4. 17–19.

[34] *Ib.*, 20–35.

[35] Gadd (*HMU* 81) has suggested, with due caution, the interesting hypothesis that it may have been Eannatum who really overthrew the First Dynasty of Ur. But there does not appear to be sufficient reason to doubt the evidence of the king lists as regards the events under discussion. The repeated clashes between the Elamites and the troups of Eannatum certainly indicate that the north-eastern neighbors of Sumer were a formidable force at that time, and it is more than likely that their power was felt in Sumer long before the conquests of Eannatum.

[36] Cf. ch. V.

Tradition has thus guided us to the very uncertain ground of the great diluvian divide. To get across we must have recourse to another means of transportation. Fortunately, the new vehicle is at once more substantial and less insecure.

So-called linguistic paleontology has been employed with a great deal of success in the investigation of problems that lie beyond the sphere of history. It was notably helpful, as we have seen, in the discovery of the connection between pre-Indo-European Greece and Anatolia;[40] it is also practically the only means for a tentative solution of the question as to where the original home of the Indo-Europeans is to be sought.[41] Let us try to tap this neglected source in application to our present problem. Our *pièce de resistance* will be the study of place-names.

---

[37] Langdon, *OECT* II. 11, transcribes *En-me-en-bara-gi-gur*; but the final sign is quite definitely *si* (cf. *ib.*, pl. I col. 2. 35) as already noted by Dhorme, *RB* 1926: 68, note 11. It may be added that the signs *si* and *gur* are sometimes difficult to distinguish in proper names. This is particularly the case in the Kirkuk tablets; cf. Gadd, *Revue d'Assyriologie* (*RA*) XXIII 77, note ad no. 249.

[38] *OECT* pl. I col. 2. 36–37: *lù ma-da NIM*(*ki*)*-ma* (*giš*)*ku-bi ib-ta-an-gam.*

[39] *Ib.*, 43.

[40] Cf. Kretschmer, *Einleitung*, and see above, ch. I, notes 9, 10.

[41] See especially H. H. Bender, *The Home of the Indo-Europeans* (Princeton, 1922). *The Aryans*, by V. Gordon Childe, is not conclusive from a philological point of view, valuable though it is for its discussions of the archaeological data.

It has been noted that the names of the oldest Sumerian sites have for the most part no adequate etymology in Sumerian.[42] It may be added that the same names resist even more emphatically all attempts at connecting them with Semitic elements.[43] This is especially true of the place-names applied in the cuneiform literature to the sites which are said to have existed before the Flood.[44]

The texts speak generally of five cities in which the prediluvian kings are reported to have ruled. These are:

1. Eridu (written ideographically NUN^{ki});
2. Bad-tibira (wr. BÀD.URUDU.NAGAR^{ki});
3. Larak (wr. UD.UD.AK^{ki});
4. Zimbir (Semitic Sippar, wr. UD.KIB.NUN^{ki});
5. Shuruppak or Shurippak (wr. SU.KÚR.RU^{ki}LAM).

A variant version has Shubar(i) (wr. Ḫ̮A.A^{ki}) for Eridu, and adds a sixth city to the list: Zarar (Arar?) or Larsa (wr. UD.UNU^{ki}). This addition has been plausibly explained as due to the desire of local patriots to have their city represented as one of the oldest in the land;[45] for our purpose it is not necessary to worry about these details, for Zarar might just as well be included in the discussion. That the tradition concerning the prediluvian sites was a well-established one may be gathered from the fact that it persisted as late as the Babylonian priest Berossus, who lived in the third century B.C. Even though we have only poorly preserved excerpts of his *Babyloniaca*,[46] it is possible to recover the ancient Mesopotamian names from under the textual débris; on the whole they correspond quite well to the prototypes of two thousand years earlier.[47]

---

[42] Cf. Meissner, "Sumerer und Semiten in Babylonien," *AfO* V 8.

[43] That the name of Ur signified 'light,' and was "perhaps identical with the Semitic word having that meaning" (so Gadd, *HMU* 12), is scarcely correct. The Semitic etymology is precluded by the full form of the name, *viz.*, *Urim*, dialectal *Ilib*. For an alternative derivation see below.

[44] For a general discussion of the prediluvian sites cf. especially: Dhorme, *RB* 1924: 537–556, and Zimmern, *ZDMG* 1924: 20–27.

[45] Cf. Gadd, *HMU* 6. The variant version in question is published in *OECT* II pl. VI, lower half.

Upon a closer examination of the above names it will be noted that two of them, Larak and Shuruppak, end in *ak*. Zimbir and Zarar have the termination *r*, in common with Shubar, which was probably a place in the neighborhood of Eridu.[48] Bad-Tibira means 'the compound of metal-workers,' of perhaps 'the compound of (the god) Tibira.'[49] The name is a descriptive designation rather than a proper name in the strictest sense of the word. Eri-du or Eri-da, as it is also found, is written with an ideogram that may be translated as 'Princeton'. It is doubtless a good Sumerian word, the first element of which means 'city' (*eri*, a dialectal variant for

---

[46] See P. Schnabel, *Berossos und die babylonisch-hellenistische Literatur* (Leipzig, 1923).

[47] Cf. Zimmern, *l. c.*

[48] The bilingual text, which gives the reading *šu-ba-ri* for the ideographic form, is cited by Poebel, *HT* 121; another text supplies the rendering *šu?-'a-a-ra*, making it appear that the actual pronunciation was *šuwari* (*ib.*). As *ḪA.A*(*ki*) is usually mentioned in connection with Eridu (cf. *ib.* 122, and *RB* 1924, 545, cf. also B. Landsberger, *Der kultische Kalender*, 73, n. 1.), there can be little doubt that the two cities were situated close to one another. There were two other cities written *ḪA.A*(*ki*), but nothing is known about them; cf. Poebel, *l. c.* For new texts mentioning all three places see Chiera, *Sumerian Lexical Texts* 211, col. 4. 4–6, and 213, col. 5. 5–7; in both passages, two of the names are written A.ḪA(ki), and the third one appears as ḪA.A(ki). Whether the rendering *šu-ba-ri* applied to all three names is not known. In fact, the phonetic spelling is attested only for A.ḪA, while the prediluvian city of W-B. 62, 1. 3, is really written ḪA.A. It may be, therefore, that the latter was never pronounced *Šubari* at all, though that possibility is rather remote.

[49] Bad-Tibira is the *Pautibibla* of Berossus, see especially Dhorme, *RB* 1924: 551 and Zimmern *ZDMG* 1924: 25. For the connection of the god *Dumu-zi Tammuz* with both Bad-Tibira and ḪA.A(ki) cf. *ib.* 539 ff. For the god *Tibira* see Deimel,. *Pantheon Babylonicum* (*PB*) 263. That *Tibira* is the first element in the name of the Biblical *Tūbal-Cain* is suggested by Langdon and Sayce, cf. *OECT* II 8, n. 2.

uru).[50] Still we must not forget the substitution of Shubari for Eridu in a rival version. At all events, four of the six cities may be definitely regarded as neither Sumerian nor Semitic. Outwardly they are marked as such by their endings *ak* and *r*.

In looking for possible linguistic connections to which the above names may point, we are immediately reminded of the fact that the suffixes in question are characteristic of Elamitic nouns in the singular. It will not surprise us therefore if we find in the language of Elam (as well as in the related branches of Lullu and Kassite) a large number of proper names showing the same terminations. A few examples will perhaps suffice to establish the point.

We have the Elamitic gods as in BA.ŠA-Shushinak, on the one hand, and Pinikir, Kirpisir, Ruhuratir, and Nitutir on the other.[51] In the personal names one of the most common elements is Shilhak, as in Simti-Shilhak, Shilhak-Inshushinak, etc.[52] Of the place-names ending in *ak*, perhaps the most interesting is Awak (wr. *a-wa-a-ak*^{ki}).[53] We have met before with the name Awan, which we found to designate one of the important provinces of Elam. Available geographical data have strongly favored the equation of Awan with Awak, but for this there was hitherto no satisfactory evidence.[54] Fortunately, we are now in a position to settle the question beyond any possibility of dispute. In a recently published volume of Royal Inscriptions from Ur, the name is found three times spelled out *a-wa-an*^{ki}-*ka*.[55] The phonetic complement *ka* is extraordinarily illuminating. It makes it certain, for one, that Awan and Awak are identical. At the same time it provides us with a clue to the variant spellings. The place-name ended in *an*, whereas *k* was merely a nominal suffix, which could be conceivably omitted in proper names on certain occasions. Geographical designations in (*a*)*n* are otherwise well known from Elamite and neighboring territories; cf. Anshan, Halwan, Bunban,[56] and Adamdun, the latter occurring in the very three passages in which *a-wa-an*^{ki} is found. The whole phrase is from an account of the ill-fated Ibi-Sin, according to which "Susa, Adamdun, and Awan(k) like a storm he had smitten." With the addition of the suffix, the name was probably pronounced *Awãk*, with a nasalized or specially accented vowel (hence the writing *a-wa-a-ak* for *a-wa-a*(*n*)-*ak*); similarly, El. *sunki-k* 'king' really indicates a pronunciation *sũ-kik*. Examples of place-names ending in (*i*)*r* will be given in a later chapter in connection with the Lullu, and we may now turn back to the Mesopotamian place-names to apply there the results of our present finds.

---

[50] Cf. Poebel, *SG* 15.

[51] Cf. Deimel, *o. c.*; Hommel, *Ethnologie* 35, 506 n. 3, and "Die elamische Götter-Siebenheit," *Haupt Volume* 159–168; Hüsing *OLZ* 1905: 385–390.

[52] Of course, we must not confuse personal names with place-names, although it is not always possible to differentiate between the two groups structurally. The above enumeration, very general of necessity, has the single object of demonstrating that the suffixes in question pervaded the entire onomastic material of Elamite.

[53] For the spelling cf. Boissier, *RA* XVI 161 1. 16; for other renderings of the same name see the article of Ebeling in *RLA* 118 b.

[54] Cf. Albright, *JAOS* 45. 232, Hommel, *Haupt Volume* 166f. Langdon (*CAH* I 367) says that Awan "was later known as Awak in Kazallu," but without any proof. The city *A-wa-al*(*ki*), which is mentioned in *MDEP* XIV p. 89, no. 33, and in the inscription of Ilushuma of Ashur, *AOB* I p. 8, col. 2. 23, is regarded by Meissner (*ib.* p. 9, n. 9) as perhaps identical with *Awan-Awak-A-bi-ak*.

---

[55] *URI* 210. 3, 211, 3, 289, 13. This *Ka* is not a genitive ending.

[56] For Anshan see *RLA* 111 f., and note 5 of this chapter. For Halwan/Halman cf. *Orientalia* 36–38 (1929) 71, and Albright, *JAOS* 45. 212. Bunban is mentioned in connection with the Elamite campaign of Sargon of Agade; cf., Poebel, *HGT* 34, col. 12. 31. It is needless to add that the number of place-names from the eastern districts of ancient Mesopotamia, which ended in *an*, is much larger than could possibly be indicated in the present discussion. The same applies to the designations with other characteristic suffixes, to which attention is called in this work. Since the study of the toponymic material is in the present instance only incidental to the main subject, *viz.*, that of the interrelations of the ancient peoples of the highlands which fringe Mesopotamia, going into greater detail would inevitably tend to obscure the whole.

The prediluvian names ending in *ak*[57] and in *r* may be now assigned definitely to an Elamitic or a related source. This bears out to a remarkable degree the evidence of tradition according to which Mesopotamia was, as we have seen, in contact with Elam since immemorial times. We may now go even further than that; since it is the majority of the oldest geographical terms that belong to the Elamitic speech-group, it follows that members of that group formed the oldest population of Lower Mesopotamia. The fact that the mythical kings who lived in the prediluvian cities bear perfectly good Sumerian names cannot be used as evidence to the contrary. Nothing is more natural than that the Sumerians should have created their lengendary heroes according to their own images. But when it came to placing them in settlements of remotest antiquity, they could not very well invent the places.[58] It was only too well known at the time when the chronological lists were compiled, which cities were really the oldest in the country. "Shuruppak," Ut-naphishtim tells Gilgamesh, "the city which thou knowest, . . . that city was already old when the gods were moved in their hearts to institute the Deluge."[59] In this respect tradition is absolutely sound, and it will be seen later on that archaeological researches have served to corroborate it admirably.

---

[57] That the Babylonian place-names ending in *ak* are suggestive of an Elamitic origin was already mentioned by Hommel, *Ethnologie* 417, n. 2. Of course, this suffix must not be confused with the Sumerian genitive-ending *a*(*k*). But the danger of such confusion is very slight. For in the first place, only such names with the suffix in question as have no obvious Sumerian etymology are taken here into consideration. Furthermore, the Sumerian genitive-suffix usually looses its *k*, except where there is a double genitive: *ak-a*(*k*)>*aka*. For the latter there is seldom any call in uncompounded place-names.

[58] This argument was overlooked by Meissner, *AfO* V 8, although the non-Sumerian character of the city-names under discussion was correctly diagnosed by that scholar.

[59] Cf. *Gilgamesh Epic* 11. 11–14. The variant writings of Shuruppak as SU.KÚR.RU(ki) and SU.KÚR.LAM(ki) are due to contamination with the ideographic writing for the old Babylonian city of Aratta, LAM.KÚR.RU(ki), influenced no doubt by LAM+KÚR.RU(ki), which is one of the forms for Shuruppak (Meissner, *Seltene assyrische Ideogramme*, no. 6812). This was

With these criteria in mind, we may examine briefly the names of several other ancient cities, whose claim to antiquity does not rest, however, on such classical sources as the above. Akshak,[60] A/Eshnunnak,[61] Apirak,[62] and the like, betray themselves immediately by their ending. The early dynastic city of Hamazi may be compared with the Elamitic Barahsi.[63] The two share their common ending with a large number of names which were at home in the eastern section of the Zagros, such as Buna-si, Gizinki-si, Sime-si, Larbu-sa,[64] and we may also add the now well-known Nu-zi, the Nu-u-za of the Elamite inscrip-

---

pointed out by Dhorme, *RB* 1924: 546–7, Zimmern, *ZDMG* 1924: 21, and Albright, *JAOS* 45. 206–7.

[60] For Akshak/Upi cf. *RLA* 64 f.

[61] For Ashnunnak (whose later, Kassite name was Tupliash) cf. Streck, Assurbanipal III. 773; the references in Delitzsch "*Wo lag das Paradies*? (1881), are still useful; cf. ib., 230 f., where *Umliaš* is to be corrected to *Tupliaš*. Among the rulers of Ashnunnak, who may be considered as contemporary with the Dynasty of Agade, Legrain (*Historical Fragments* 12) lists: Kallamu, Ituria, and Gibil-lama. For the location of Ashnunnak see Albright, *JAOS* 45. 216 f.

[62] For Apirak cf. *RLA* 119. The city is listed in the account of the rebellion against Naram-Sin (Boissier, *RA* XVI 162 ff.). which is now available in Barton, *RISA*, cf. p. 140, Rs. 16. The historicity of that account has been doubted of late, especially by Landsberger, *ZA* XXXV 215 f. On the other hand, it is worth noting that the expedition of Naram-Sin against Apirak is commemorated in the omen-texts, cf. Weidner, *FM* 232, 1. 18. Ebeling, *RLA* 119, is in favor of the assumption that Apirak is to be connected with Awan-Awak-Awal (see above, n. 54). However, in view of the fact that Awak is mentioned in the same text (Barton, *RISA* Ob. 15) in which Apirak is also found, it will be necessary to keep the two sites apart, though they are evidently to be sought in the same district.

[63] For Hamazi/ṣi and its ruler Hadanish see *OECT* II, pl. II, col. 4. 38–39. That the name Hadanish is suggestive of Gutian origin is pointed out by S. Smith, *EHA* 41.

[64] For detailed references to these names see Boudou, *Orientalia* 36–38 (1929). Cf. also Hüsing *Zagros* 22, and Speiser, *Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research* (*AASOR*) VIII 15 ff.; cf. also ch. IV.

tions.[65] Since we know that Barah-si (also wr. Barah-she, Para-she, etc.) lay between Elam proper and Shubari, or northern Mesopotamia,[66] the above comparison receives further geographic support. That *si/še* was an ending may be seen from the following variant spellings of a city which is to be located in the district of Arrapha: Paharra-she, Paharra-shwa, and Paharri-wa.[67] Here *še* is the nominal suffix, and *wa* the usual genitive/locative termination of Hurrian, to be expected in a letter written by a king of Mitanni.[68] In passing may be mentioned the district-names Kima-sh,[69] Sima-sh, and Tukri-sh, all of them belonging to the region of Arrapha and the Lullu. The name of the ruler of Hamazi, Hadanish, also points in the same direction. Strictly speaking, therefore, the sibilant suffix is not so much characteristic of Elam as it is of her north-western neighbors, the Lullu, Gutians, Kassites, etc. They will be discussed more fully in a later chapter.

---

[65] Cf. Hüsing, *Quellen* p. 76. 1. 90, where *Nu-u-za* is listed in connection with Arrapha. See also Poebel, *ZA* XXXIX (1929) 137.

[66] See *URI* 274. col. 1. Among the names that occur in connection with Barahsi, as early as the period of the Dynasty of Agade, the following may be cited from the long text in Poebel, *HGT* 34: *Abalgamaš* (king of B.), col. 23. 5; *Sidgau* (viceroy = *šakkanaku*), *ib.* 10. *Kumdusu* (judge; Poebel reads the name *Kum-du-bá*, cf. *HT*. 187, but the last sign is better read su_6), col. 12. 45; *Dagu* (brother of the king), *ib.*, 25. Then there is *Zina*, governor of *Hu* . . . , *Hidarida* . . . , governor of *Gunilaha*, etc., cf. col. 12. These names are probably Gutian or Lullubian, rather than Elamite, which is precisely what we would expect in view of the fact that Barahsi lay in the north-western corner of Elam, cf. *URI*, *l. c.* The name *Abalgamaš* may be confidently regarded as Gutian on account of the element *-laga-* (*Aba-l(a)ga-ma-š*), as is demonstrated in ch. IV. The listing of these names in connection with Elam is due to the fact that Barahsi is usually linked with Elam in the historical texts. And since the Gutian and Lullubian dialects belong to the larger Elamite group, the philological continuity of this essay is not seriously disturbed by this arrangement. It is very probable that Barahsi was the connecting link between Elam on the one hand, and Lullu and Guti on the other, not only geographically but also dialectally.

[67] Cf. Speiser, *JAOS* 49. 272, n. 3.

[68] Since the *š* of the Kirkuk inscriptions often interchanges with *s*, it is very likely that both *še* and *si* indicate the same ending.

[69] Cf. now Poebel, *ZA* XXXIX 136 ff., and Landsberger, *ib.* XXXV 230, n. 2. For further details see ch. IV.

For a later discussion I must also reserve several names ending in a labial, such as Adab, and Kullab. In the meantime I should like to call attention to the following. In the case of a place like Akshak we have the rival name of Upi (Opis). Now that we have deduced the existence in Sumer of an older non-Sumerian stock, it is reasonable to explain the twin names by assuming that the one belongs to the older, the other to the more recent population. The same explanation will probably account in a few cases for the striking disparity between the ideographic and the phonetic renderings of the same geographic designation. It is not at all improbable, *e. g.*, that Shubar(i) was the pre-Sumerian term for that prediluvian site, while ḪA.A represents some Sumerian equivalent. To be sure, this argument must not be carried too far. In certain instances the so-called ideographic writing is probably nothing more than a phonetic representation which we have as yet failed to recognize. This seems to be at least the case with the name Larak. The writing UD.UD.AK(ki) is evidently phonetic and should be really transcribed *lā-lā-ak* from which *la-ra-ak* developed, as Poebel has suggested.[70] For a similar interchange we may compare Zarar, whose variant form *lar-sa* may go back to *rar-sa*, probably a transposed form of *za-rar*.[71] In both instances we have entirely normal dissimilations of liquids. Consonantal interchanges are found in Sumerian also apart from proper names, but there the phonetic processes are bound up intimately with the correspondences between one dialect and another. A phonetic study of the Sumerian dialects is likely to furnish results that may prove of importance to departments other than philology. In our present study of the ethnic conditions in ancient Mesopotamia we must submit the subject to a brief examination, even though the conclusions cannot, in the nature of things, have more than a tentative value. An exhaustive study of the problem of Sumerian dialects would exceed the scope of the present work; it is hoped, however, that such authorities as Poebel and Deimel will find it possible to re-examine the question from an ethnic angle. My present attempt in this direction is necessarily in the nature of a preliminary essay.

---

[70] *HT* 34. A place called *La-ra-ag* is also mentioned in Forrer *BoTU* II no. 3. l. 14.

[71] Assuming of course, that this and not *a-rar*(*ki*) is the correct form, the signs *za* and *a* are so close that a clear differentiation between them is not always possible. I cannot go here into further details, beyond noting that the reading is still uncertain. For a recent discussion of the sources relating to Larsa cf. Ch.-F. Jean, "Larsa d'après les textes cunéiformes," *Babyloniaca X* (1927) 161–237.

There can be no longer any serious doubt that the Sumerians were not the first people to occupy Lower Mesopotamia. Apart from the evidence of the oldest place-names, we have for this deduction the independent verdict of archaeology, as will be demonstrated in the following chapter. It follows that the Sumerian invaders encountered in the land an older population, which may or may not have been of a uniform stock. We have seen that the Elamites, or a people closely related to the Elamites, constituted at least an important element in that pre-Sumerian population.[72] As the languages of the Sumerians and the Elamites were not related,[73] Lower Mesopotamia must have remained bilingual for some time after the conquest. Ultimately the speech of the Sumerians prevailed, and it was able to hold its own until its gradual displacement by Akkadian[74] at the turn of the second millennium. What happened in the meantime to the users of the pre-Sumerian speech?

---

[72] This is one of the few facts in connection with the history of Elam, which Hüsing did not estimate correctly. He started originally with the assumption that the Sumerians preceded the Elamites, a theory that was perfectly justified until the archaeological evidence from Susa, and recently also from Sumer, has caused us to reverse the former chronological sequence of the two peoples.

[73] For the oldest Elamite texts see now P. Scheil, *Textes de comptabilité proto-élamites, nouvelle série* (*MDEP* XVII), Paris, 1924. For the so-called proto-Elamite writing cf. C. Frank, *RV* III 83–84.

It is certainly not going too far to assume that the older language disappeared in Sumer in the course of a few generations. The highly civilized invaders had no difficulty in imposing their own speech upon the country, as is amply established by the character of the oldest records found in Mesopotamia. Elements of the older stock persisted only in a number of proper names, and presumably also in some inevitable loan-words. But is that all? Does not an ethnic substratum affect the language of the newcomers beyond the extent of such sporadic survivals? The analogy based on other similar situations is certainly in favor of the assumption that the language of the Sumerians themselves must have undergone more subtle and internal changes as a result of contact with the older inhabitants. Now those changes would affect primarily the phonology of the superimposed language. To lend support to this statement, one could adduce a great many illustrations; I think, however, that two will be sufficient.

Where Akkadian differs most thoroughly from the other Semitic languages is in the department of phonology. Though the group as a whole is markedly rich in guttural sounds, the latter are but feebly represented in Akkadian; as against the six laryngals of Arabic, the Semitic speech of Mesopotamia has preserved only two, ḫ and the *'alif*-sound, to both of which it held on rather uncertainly. Vocalic differences are equally pronounced. These drastic departures in Akkadian are simply and universally explained as due to the prolonged contact with non-Semitic peoples to which the Semites of Mesopotamia were notably exposed.[75] Under those circumstances the specifically Semitic features of speech could not be preserved in their original purity. Another illustration may be borrowed from the Indo-European field. The well-known sound-shifts of the Germanic branch have no counterpart in the other groups of Indo-European. They have given a very individual aspect to the speech-sounds of the Germanic languages. And here, too, the changes are commonly explained as due to the influence of a heterogeneous ethnic substratum.[76]

---

[74] For the earliest appearance of the Akkadians in Mesopotamia see especially ch. V. Poebel has recently called attention to the very interesting fact that as early as the time of Lugalannimundu of Adab, a ruler of Abul-ad(ki) bears the Semitic (Semitized would be more correct) name Šu-an-nu-um (Za XXXIX 139). It is quite true that Bauer, *Die Ostkananaanäer*, p. 94 (additions to p. 84) calls the text of Lugalannimundu, published by Poebel in *HGT* 75, a legend. But Gadd (*RA* XXIII 68, n. 45) rightly calls Bauer to task for disposing of the text in question so unceremoniously.

To return to ancient Mesopotamia, we must expect considerable changes in Sumerian phonology, if it is indeed true that the Elamites and their congeners occupied the field before the Sumerian-speaking invaders. Unfortunately, we do not know of any relatives with which Sumerians could be compared in order to establish the extent of the phonetic changes that resulted from the invasion.[77] We do have, however, another valuable source of information on this very point.

---

[75] Cf. G. Bergsträsser, *Einführung in die semitischen Sprachen* (Munich, 1928), 20 f.

[76] See especially Jespersen, *Language* (New York, 1924) 191 f.

[77] It would require a lengthy article to discuss briefly the various attempts that have been made by scholars to connect Sumerian with some better known linguistic groups. I shall indicate here only a few of the more pronounced tendencies which may be observed in this highly speculative field of investigation. F. Hommel has been the principal sponsor of the Altaic, and specifically Turkoid, theory of the origin of Sumerian, cf. *Ethnologie* 21 ff., and 985. M. Tseretheli tried to establish the relationship between Sumerian and the Caucasian languages, and particularly with Georgian. Cf. his series of articles on "Sumerian and Georgian," in *JRAS* 1913–1915. The correspondences which Tseretheli has pointed out are primarily lexical, and for that reason inconclusive as long as there are no definite proofs of a thoroughgoing morphological connection. In addition, many of the Sumerian examples cited by T. will bear a better interpretation. Bork has also advocated the Caucasian theory of Sumerian linguistic relations, cf. *OLZ* 1924: 169 ff. Th. Kluge has gone as far

I have indicated above that Sumerian dialects may be investigated with profit in our search for additional data on the ethnic conditions in ancient Mesopotamia. The texts report the existence of several distinct dialects; but apart from the main type of Sumerian, in which the bulk of the literature has been preserved, we are tolerably well informed concerning only one other dialect known as EME.SAL (hereafter abbreviated as ES).[78] The latter is known from several syllabaries and from a number of compositions of a religious character. The main dialect is now termed EME.KU (abbr. EK); EME means 'language' in Sumerian, but the significance of KU and of SAL is still uncertain.[79] The dialects must not be confused with the successive stages of the same branch of the language as represented in its historical development. For within the main dialect there is, of course, a marked difference between the archaic and the later texts.[80] As a general guiding princi-

---

afield as the Bantu family in search of the relatives of Sumerian. According to him the latter reached the same degree of development as Bantu, which is scarcely a convincing argument; cf. his monograph, *Welcher Sprachengruppe ist das Sumerische anzugliedern?* (Leipzig, 1921). Ch. Autran produced a lengthy but entirely unconvincing study in his *Sumérien et Indo-Européen; l'aspect morphologique de la question* (Paris, 1925). Autran has not treated all the available parallels between Sumerian and Indo-European; but any number of possible borrowings, and a series of coincidences in morphological and sound-similarities, will not suffice to prove the relationship of two languages, where the differences are as pronounced as in this case. Even the South-Sea islands have been invaded in this restless search; cf. A. Jeremias, *Handbuch der altorientalischen Geisteskultur* (Leipzig, 1929) 4, and the article of Ed. Stuben on Polynesian material in Sumer, which Jeremias cites. This seems little better than looking for the proverbial needle in a haystack. So far, we are not much nearer to the problem than we were at the time when Sumerian was first generally recognized as an independent language.

[78] Cf. Poebel, *SG* 6.

[79] See Deimel, *Sumerische Grammatik* (Rome, 1924) 1 (p. 2) and 22 (p. 79).

[80] Thus Deimel's *Grammatik* deals only with the archaic period of the language. Poebel speaks frequently of late Sumerian or post-Sumerian (that is after Sumerian ceased to be a spoken language) records; cf. *e.g.*, *SG* 90.

ple it may be stated that a historical grammar of Sumerian would be concerned chiefly with morphological changes; a comparative account of the Sumerian dialects, on the other hand, would have to devote much space to phonetic correspondences. It is by their phonology that EK and ES are usually recognized.

To turn now to ES, the available material is too scanty for setting up exact laws of phonetic interchange with EK. We can only tabulate the known phonetic changes,[81] of which the principal ones concern the liquids and nasals, the dentals, and the palatal or velar stop *g*. No conclusions as to the nature of ES can be based on the treatment of the sonorous sounds, since similar changes occur also within EK. From the fact that EK *d* often corresponds to ES *z* we may gather that the latter dialect tended towards assibilation under certain conditions; e.g., EK *dug* 'good' becomes *zeb* in ES.[82] The most drastic treatment, however, is accorded in ES to the *g* of EK. That sound may become either *m* (*w*) or *b*, it may change to *d*, or else it may remain unchanged. E.G., *gal* 'to be,' and *gir* 'foot' become in ES *mal* and *meri*; EK *šag* 'heart' and *igi* 'eye' are represented by *šab* and *ibi*; *agar* 'field' is changed to *adar*, but *gin* 'firm' and *gal* 'great' remain unchanged in ES.[83] Many other examples could be cited. It may be added that the reading of the ES words is made definite by the fact that they are generally spelled out in simple syllables; e.g., *mal* is written *ma-al*, *šab* appears as *ša-ab*, etc.[84]

---

[81] See Poebel *SG* 75–87, Deimel *Grammatik* 23 (these references are to paragraphs).

[82] Poebel, *o. c.*, 84.

[83] *Ib.* 75–80. The texts on which these phonetic deductions are based are transcribed by Deimel, *Grammatik* 21.

[84] Cf. Deimel, *o. c.* 22 e. The reason for the phonetic writings in ES as opposed to the frequent ideographic renderings in EK is doubtless to be seen in the very considerable deviations of the former from EK. Since the dialect was naturally less familiar than the EK speech, it was necessary, as Deimel points

It is clear from the preceding that the phonetic differences between the two dialects are unusually pronounced; they certainly presuppose the influence of powerful factors. At the same time the variations are not as hap-hazard as they may appear at first sight; similar phonetic relationships may be noted in other linguistic groups. A very striking parallel, e.g., is found in Indo-European. In Greek, for instance, β, δ and γ may all develop out of a single sound of primitive Indo-European, the labiovelar $g^{\underset{\frown}{u}}$;[85] in our case we have the same group of labial, dental, and palatal in ES, traceable to an EK *g*. I do not, of course, intend to suggest any relationship whatsoever between Sumerian and Indo-European. What the above parallel indicates is merely the fact that under certain conditions it is phonetically possible for one type of *g* to become quite normally a labial or a dental, while in other instances the *g*-character may be retained.[86] The example from Greek phonology is also helpful in another direction; it shows that the entire course of the phonetic development in question did not take place within Greek, but that the changes were marked by the very considerable distance that separates Greek from primitive Indo-European. In other words, such radical developments as the above are not consummated in their entirety within a closely knitted linguistic unit.

I hope to be excused for this somewhat strange excursion into a distant field, on the ground that there was much to be gained by such a step. Now I shall not feel unjustified in assuming that between the *g* in EK and its correspondents in

---

out, to render the ES forms phonetically in order to indicate the correct pronunciation.

[85] Cf. Wright, *Comparative grammar of the Greek language* 97 ff.

[86] Since the ES material is so deplorably scanty, it is as yet impossible to set up exact phonetic laws for each of the above changes. All we can do is to list their occurrences. The peculiarities of the cuneiform script increases, of course, the difficulty of making a precise phonetic study of the Sumerian dialects.

ES there was an intermediary which may be tentatively regarded as labio-velar (g^u); moreover, the change could not have taken place in a short time and within a uniform and uncontaminated group of Sumerians. Since there is no indication in the main dialect that its *g*-sound was liable to the diversified treatment to which it is submitted in ES, and that it was a labio-velar, we are confronted with the following alternatives: both dialects were very distinct branches of some distant proto-Sumerian; if not, then we must see in the users of ES a heterogeneous ethnic group, whose phonetic range varied greatly from that of the real Sumerians. The former suggestion is obviously far-fetched. It would force us to assume several waves of Sumerian invasion, separated by many centuries one from the other, and coming from a source where there existed already markedly different branches of that family. For all that we do not have the slightest evidence. The alternative assumption would be that ES represented a dialect of Sumerian spoken by the non-Sumerian population of the country. It easily accounts for the differences pointed out above,[87] and it is further supported by all the arguments used in deducing a pre-Sumerian element in Mesopotamia on wholly independent grounds as we have seen.

---

[87] An ethnic substratum which took over the Sumerian speech would be expected to modify the sounds of the borrowed language in accordance with its own phonetic repertoire. It is not improbable, therefore, that the proto-Elamites, or their near relatives, who formed the pre-Sumerian population of Lower Mesopotamia, treated in this manner some of the Sumerian *g*-sounds. If it may be tentatively assumed that those proto-Elamites had a group of labialized velars, it would follow that the Sumerian corresponding sounds were bound to be subjected to the treatment which the borrowing substratum accorded to those sounds in its original language. It will be remembered that connections have been pointed out between Elamite and the Caucasian languages. According to Hüsing (*Memnon* IV. 31 ff.) it is with Tsakhurian that Elamite was most closely related; Marr claims that the K'artvel languages (*i.e.* the southwest Caucasian group of Dirr's classification) offer closer parallels (cf. RV VI 262). In either case, the relations of Elamite would be with a linguistic family whose phonetic system is extraordinarily extensive, particularly as regards the palatal-velar sounds; cf. Bleichsteiner, *RV* VI 260. It is very significant in this connection that the phonetic similarities which Tseretheli

The geographic distribution of ES is a question of considerable importance to our problem. Unfortunately, the available material is not very committal on this point. All we know is that Nippur may be considered as the border line between the two dialects, since the EK texts from that site show several peculiarities common in ES. Thus the word for 'god' is found in a Nippur syllabary as *dimir* intead of the normal *di*(*n*)*gir* of EK, with the characteristic substitution of *m* for *g*.[88] Moreover, Sumerian loan-words in Akkadian often appear in an ES guise; e.g., *šamallū* 'merchant's apprentice' (Aramaic *šwalyā*) goes back to the *šaman-la* of ES and not to the EK form *šagan-la*.[89] It appears therefore that ES was spoken in what was later Akkadian territory, north of Nippur, while EK was at home in Sumer proper.

The above conclusions were reached before I had an opportunity to consult the recent Sumerian Grammar of Father Anton Deimel. Along different lines, Deimel has arrived at almost identical results with regard to the distribution of the dialects, and it is to me a source of no mean gratification to have been anticipated by so prominent a student of Sumerian. Most instructive is a passage *restored* by Deimel, which gives the equation *EME.KU* = *lišān Šumeri*, *EME.SAL* = *lišān Akkadi* "EME.KU, the language of Sumer; EME.SAL, the

---

has observed between Georgian and Sumerian apply largely to the ES dialect of the latter, cf. *JRAS* 1915. 266 ff. For phonetic changes in Sumerian cf. also Fossey, *Hilprecht Anniversary Volume* 105–120.

[88] Cf. Poebel, *SG* 6, and especially *ZA* XXXIX 149. Instead of the usual EK forms *di*(*n*)*gir* 'god,' *šagan* 'agent,' we find in Nippur *dimir* and *šaman*, or with the ES change of *g* to *m*; on the other hand, the Nippur-ES form *ni-mi-ir* 'prefect' corresponds to the usual ES *libir*, thus gravitating towards EK. Poebel rightly considers these peculiarities as very important and suggestive.

[89] Poebel, *SG* 55.

language of Akkad."[90] Of great value is also the statement of Deimel that the northern dialect is not a late development, since traces of EME.SAL are found as early as the archaic texts from Fara (Shuruppak).[91] The dialect must therefore be assigned to the original population of the country, and not to tribes that arrived in Lower Mesopotamia after the Sumerian invasion.[92] Thus it may be posited that the native population was driven northwards by the foreign conquerors, where they remained under the cultural influence of Sumer, but where they must have also come in contact with members of a third race, the Semites. The relative chronological position of the Sumerians and the Semites will be discussed in the next chapter.

---

[90] *Grammatik* 21 (p. 76).

[91] *Ib.*, p. 90.

[92] The fact that ES is designated as the language of Akkad is interesting for more than one reason. Akkad (*Agade*) became the term for northern Babylonia, and for its Semitic inhabitants, only after the conquests of Sargon and the subsequent choice of Agade as the capital of the empire. Unfortunately, we have no definite information as to the name of the country in pre-Sargonic days; we are equally in the dark with regard to the name by which the earliest Semites of Mesopotamia were known to the Sumerians. Now from the geographic distribution of ES we have gathered, (*a*) that a Sumerian dialect was spoken in Akkad from very early times, and (*b*) that the dialect in question had really been borrowed by the pre-Sumerian population of the country. In this connection it is certainly worth noting that among the foreign glosses which are listed occasionally in the Assyrian syllabaries, the few that are given as Akkadian (URI^{ki}) bear a non-Semitic character; cf. (*šam*)*hi-nu?-bir* 'ricinus,' whose ending points to the Elamitic group. On the subject of the foreign glosses see the very useful article of C. Frank, "Fremdsprachige Glossen in assyrischen Listen und Vokabularen," *FM* 36–45 (cf. especially p. 38, n. 6). Moreover, it appears that even as late as the first millennium, the Haldian inscriptions identified Akkad with Lullu, cf. Tseretheli, *Die neuen ḫaldischen Inschriften König Sardurs von Urarṭu*," p. 54, note to line 17. And lastly, the very name *Aga-de* has the same ending as one of the important cities of the Lullu, *viz.*, *Arak-di* (Ashurnasirpal, Annals II. 78); cf. also such Hurrian place-names as *Lub-di*, *Tai-di*, *Irri-di*, *etc.* All these indications, while not conclusive in themselves, render it very likely, when viewed as a whole, that the available philological evidence confirms the theory that the oldest population of Akkad had much in common with the Elamitic group.

We are now prepared to touch upon another controversial point, *viz.*, the origin of the name "Sumer." As is well known *māt Šumerim* is the Akkadian designation for the country of Sumer, for which the Sumerian name is *Ki-en-gi*(*r*); the final *r* is attested by the phonetic complement *ra*, which is found occasionally after the name.[93] There can be little doubt that *Kengir* and *Šumer* go back to a common source, but the intervening phonetic steps require a convincing explanation. *Šumer* cannot go back directly to *Kengir* as the gap between the two is too great to be bridged satisfactorily. We have seen the (*n*)*g* of EK become *m* in ES, which would account for the labial in *Šumer*, provided that the name was taken over by the Akkadians from an ES source.[94] The difference between *k* and *š* is in our case more difficult to explain. The remark of Deimel that an original *k* may be palatalized into *š* in French,[95] proves nothing whatever for Sumerian, until it has been shown that the latter also resorted to the practice of palatalization. However, we have no grounds for that assumption. The matter becomes simplified if we confine our examination to ES. We have seen that the latter was spoken by the non-Sumerian inhabitants of the land, whom we had previously identified as an Elamitic element. Now in the Elamite group palatalization appears to have been common; cf. the variation between *Anšan* and *Anzan*, which presupposes a form *Ančan*. It follows that the name *Šumer* was introduced by the pre-Sumerian inhabitants in the form of *Čemer*, or the like, from an older *Čeg̱uer*, which the Sumerians represented by *Kengir* (or even *Kyengir*, note the writing ki-en-gi-ra), while the Semites expressed the foreign word as *šemir*, which became *šumer*, due to the regular influence of *m*;

---

[93] See Deimel, *Grammatik* 1; Poebel, *SG* 1. For the relations of these names with the Biblical Shinear see Deimel, *Orientalia* 26. 77.

[94] This is an essential point to bear in mind.

[95] *Grammatik* 1.

cf. *šumu* 'name' < *šemu*. The term which the Sumerians themselves used for their country was *kalama* or 'the land' *par excellence.*[96] What the proto-Sumerian name really meant, it is impossible to determine at present: it may have been derived from the designation of some prominent city.[97]

This unexpected indication of a palatalizing tendency in ES, which was inherited as we have seen from the original pre-Sumerian language of the country, may perhaps lead to the explanation of the name by which the dialect was designated. The usual meaning of SAL is 'woman.' But why should the dialect be called 'the language of women?' There is, to my knowledge, only one other instance in the cuneiform literature where the speech of an entire people is referred to, somewhat contemptuously, as feminine. When Ashurnasirpal finally subdued the country of Zamua (the modern district of Suleimania)[98] after three strenuous campaigns, he received tribute from a number of neighboring lands, and among them from Sipirmena. The speech of the latter struck the royal scribe as very peculiar, and he interrupts his official account to say that the people of Sipirmena all "chirp like women."[99] This remarkable statement has been plausibly explained by Hüsing as a reference to the palatalized sounds of the local dialect.[100] Sipirmena lay in the territory of the Lullu, i.e., of a people related to the Elamites; it is indeed possible to infer from the variant spellings of Lullu names that the language contained palatalized sounds. To be sure, the other districts mentioned in the Zamuan account must have spoken related languages, and the scribe need not have singled out the inhabitants of Sipirmena. However, the name gave him the opportunity to make a play on words, as the Akkadian word for "chirping, etc." is *ṣapāru*. The scribe must have had his troubles in transcribing the names of of the district, so that when he came to *Sipir-mena* he could not resist expressing his sentiments, as who should say, Well may that place be called Chirp-town; this whole confounded country chirps away like women. Did the palatalizing pronunciation of ES have a similar effect on the Sumerians? One can hardly be sure of this, but the interesting parallel is worth recording.

---

[96] *Ib.* Poebel, *SG* 1, n. 2, and 77, suggests that *Kengi*(*r*) may have been derived from the ES form of *kalamma*, viz., *kanagga*. This is rather improbable in view of the fact that it is precisely the ES which must have contained the *m*-sound as represented in *Sumer*.

[97] For a place-name *Ki-en-gi*(*ki*) cf. Deimel, *o.c.* 1, n. 1. It is not impossible that *Ki/engi* is to be found in the name of the first ruler of the First Dynasty of Uruk, *Mes-ki-in-ga-še-ir* (Poebel, *HGT* 2, col. 2. 6), or [*Mes-ki*]-*èm-ga*-[*še-ir*] (*OECT* II pl. 2, col. 3. 1). In that case the name must have meant 'the hero who Sumer . . . ' The variations in the writing of the nasal (*n*, *m*) show that the spelling was phonetic rather than etymological; perhaps we have here an indication of the process whereby *ng* ultimately became *m*. On some Egyptological speculations with ragard to Meskingasher see Poplicha, *JAOS* 49: 305 ff.; they are exceedingly far-fetched and improbable.

[98] See the present writer's account in *AASOR* VIII 1 ff.

[99] Ashurnasirpal, Annals II 75–76: *ma-da-tu ša* (*mā*)*Si-pir-me-na ša kīma sinnišāti ṣap-ru-ni am-ḫur.*

The above inquiry may have been to a certain extent discursive and spread out. But where there is so much at stake every available scrap of potential evidence should be carefully examined. Some of our philological results may still be looked upon as uncertain. I am obliged to repeat, however, that I have not relied on any single type of evidence, but rather on the cumulative effect of the conclusions obtained from several independent sources. If the same clue can lead to the solution of a number of different problems, the probability becomes very strong that we are on the right track.[101] It has been shown that the historical sources put back the struggle between Elam and Sumer into very early times. Sumerian tradition goes even further by indicating that the first political event in the land was a war with Elam, as early as the First Dynasty of Kish. The study of place-names has revealed the existence of Elamites in Lower Mesopotamia at a period that was considered as pre-historic (pre-diluvian) by the Sumerians themselves. And lastly, an inquiry into the Sumerian dialects has made it exceedingly probable, if not indeed certain, that the original non-Sumerian population of the land affected very considerably the pronunciation of that dialect of Sumerian which the conquered race adopted for their own use. The very name "Shumer" is probably an inheritance from the pre-Sumerians.

---

[100] "Palatale Spirans im Lullu-Land?" *OLZ* 1903: 399.

[101] In this connection it may be of interest to call attention to the fact that Poebel has recently found traces of a hitherto unknown Sumerian dialect, which must have been localized in the districts of Kimash and Matka, or in other words, in a region where the Arraphans (Hurrians), Gutians, and Lullubians, lived in close proximity; cf. *ZA* XXXIX 128–139, "Eine neue sumerische Mundart."

If additional proof is still regarded as desirable, it can be supplied from a further, yet untapped, source. Archaeology is a field that is wholly independent of philology. Results obtained through the study of material remains are not affected by the conclusions based on the epigraphical sources. Frequently indeed archaeology is able to continue its investigation where philology has left off. If the conclusions of the two are found to tally, the case may be regarded as established. We must turn, therefore, at this juncture to a brief study of the information that archaeology has been able to contribute on the question of the earliest relations between Elam and Sumer.

CHAPTER III

THE EARLY CIVILIZATIONS OF THE NEAR EAST

THE oldest pottery yet discovered in Hither Asia is probably represented by a few specimens reported from the Musyan area, on the western border of Elam, by the French excavators Gautier and Lampre.[1] The sherds were brought to light in the deepest trench at Tepe Musyan and at the neighboring mound of Mohammed Jaffar.[2] What is of particular interest about that hand-made and primitive ware is the fact that its makers seem to have been a strictly stone-using group. The ornamentation noticed on the sherds consisted of incised and relief decoration, also of simple geometric designs applied in red paint. The discoverers thought of comparing the primitive fabric with early Egyptian types, but there is surely not enough material in this case for making such comparisons. Besides, it is very hazardous to assume extensive connections for a period that was strictly neolithic. Some scholars who claim that the original population of Elam belonged to the Dravidian group,[3] might also assign to the latter the most primitive ware of Musyan. However, there is no need to indulge in idle speculations.

Concerning the pottery of the next period known to us, we are incomparably better informed. With the ware that is often classified as "Susa I" we emerge out of obscurity into the clear light of a young and vigorous civilization. As the name indicates, the remains of that culture were first unearthed in Susa, the capital of ancient Elam.

---

[1] See J.-E. Gautier and G. Lampre, *Fouilles à Moussian: MDEP* VIII 59–148.

[2] For Illustrations cf. *ib.*, 93.

[3] Cf. Bork, *RV* III 70.

In a work like the present one, which has set itself as its object the study of wide-spread ethnic elements, it would be unduly distracting to pursue for its own sake the course of so fascinating a civilization as Susa I. We must not lose sight of the main subject. In surveying the individual cultures we can emphasize only what is relevant to the question of cultural interrelations. The archaeological inquiry is here simply a means to a more distant end. The so-called proto-Elamite civilizations have received much more attention than can be possibly reflected in the present essay, though not nearly as much as they deserve by reason of the part they played in the cultural progress of the most ancient East. A detailed treatment of those civilizations, however, would lie entirely beyond the scope of this study.

First Style. What is for our purpose of real significance is the unprecedented expansion of Susa I, or better, First Aeneolithic. The former name imposes a geographical restriction apart from implying that Susa was the original center of distribution. In point of fact, we are far from certain as to where the style was first evolved which was ultimately to spread over the huge area that extends from Upper Mesopotamia up to Baluchistan, and perhaps even China. We do know, however, that in Susa I as well as in the related cultures, there was found evidence of the first known application of metallurgy, as distinct from a casual utilization of metals. At the same time the use of neolithic implements continued for a long time; hence the name "aeneolithic." The products of the First Aeneolithic period are characterized by so many close agreements that independent developments must in this case be regarded as out of the question, in spite of the size of the area. A common source is therefore reasonably certain, though for the present we shall abstain from deciding whether such a source implies also racial unity in the homologues, or only intimate economic relations. Not to anticipate any further we shall proceed to a brief description of the remains under discussion. We will begin with the first settlement of Susa.[4]

The discovery of ceramic products that were to revolutionize completely our previous estimate of the ability of the prehistoric artist, was made by an expedition of the "Délégation en Perse" under the direction of M. de Morgan. The pottery unearthed at Susa marks one of the most important achievements of modern archaeology. The finest specimens were found in the necropolis belonging to the first township. The fabric is extraordinarily thin and delicate. The usual shapes include tall graceful tumblers, open bowls, pots with little shoulder-lugs for handling, and now and then ovoid jars. These simple forms are ornamented with designs executed in a matt black paint upon a light surface. The patterns present a rare combination of purely geometric motives with representations of natural models done in a highly stylized manner. The whole has an abstract, one might say expressionistic, effect.[5] Most admirable is the subordination of the individual motives to the main, purely decorative scheme; the ornament is with equal mastery adapted to the given shape. The vigor and simplicity of execution are further examples of the consummate skill and faultless taste of the proto-Elamite artist.

The style manifested in painted decoration is sufficiently distinctive, because of the complicated nature of its component elements, to serve as an important criterion of relationship, when fabrics from different regions are compared. The details of shape and technique are also of great value, as well as the nature of the accompanying remains, such as household implements, other domestic objects, weapons, and the like. Where the agreement in the majority of such details is sufficiently close, the presumption of relationship is correspondingly great, especially when the chronological indications are also found to correspond.

---

[4] For the literature on the First Culture of Susa cf. ch. I, notes 39–40, 41–42. See also the bibliography in G. Contenau, *Manuel d'archéologie orientale* 519 f.

[5] For the distinction between naturalistic and abstract styles see especially Frankfort, *Studies* I 18 f.

It is needless to enter here into the rather heated controversy concerning the origin of the style displayed by the early Susian ornamentation. The question is essentially an academic one; the school headed by M. Pottier holds that the stylized representation of motives borrowed from nature is a direct descendant of a more frank naturalism; Dr. Frankfort, on the other hand, has repeatedly insisted that the mentality underlying the style of Susa I was abstract from the start.[6] Of greater moment to us is the place of origin of the civilization in question. Frankfort is a strong advocate of the view that the culture was native to Susa; the French school believes that it was introduced to Susa from some other center.[7] We shall be in a better position to judge the merits of these opposing theories if we indicate briefly the type of remains found together with the pottery, and follow it with an enumeration of the remaining sites that date back to the First Aeneolithic period.

It is not due exclusively to its superb pottery that Susa I occupies so pre-eminent a position in the domain of Oriental archaeology. A far more lasting contribution to human progress was the invention of metallurgy in the true sense, for which the earliest evidence is supplied from the same deep strata at Susa. The thorough comprehension of the properties of metal, the methods of re-melting and casting after the ore has been reduced, in short, the real knowledge of metallurgy, may be said to differentiate quite adequately a historic community from a prehistoric one.[8] The necessity of supplying the invaluable raw material was probably the most powerful single factor in establishing contacts between ancient cultures, and in introducing a dynamic and progressive note into ancient life, which until then had been localized and culturally immobile. And it is in the culture of Susa I that we observe for the first time the regular use of copper implements for the needs of daily life.

---

[6] *Ib.*, 27 f.

[7] See Pottier, *RAR* XXIII 1–39.

[8] Cf. Frankford, *Studies* II 5.

Of far less significance are the finds from Susa consisting of various types of jewelry. Beads of carnelian, rock-crystal, lapis-lazuli, and the like, are practically ubiquitous in ancient eastern sites. On the other hand, engraved beads constituting the earliest types of seals must not be confused with the former. Two such seals were found in the later strata of Susa I, and as far as we know, they are the oldest devices of that type to appear in the ancient world. However, the small number of seals found renders it extremely unlikely that the article was invented at Susa.[9]

The numerous relatives of the first Susian culture are scattered across the whole of Mesopotamia and Persia; they have been discovered in Armenia, in Baluchistan, and possibly as far as Sha Ching, on the border of Mongolia and Kansu.[10] The correspondences are not exact in every detail, but the resemblances are too numerous and distinctive to be accidental. In the area of Musyan, west of Susa, we find among others the so-called "poterie fine" which is related to the ware of Susa I in technique, decoration, and partly also in shapes, as far as they can be reconstructed; the "poterie épaisse" of Musyan is also within the province of Susa I.[11] In Lower Mesopotamia, pottery from the First Aeneolithic period has been discovered at Abu Shahrein (ancient Eridu),[12] Tell el-

---

[9] A useful summary of the main finds of Susa I is given in Childe, *The Most Ancient East* 123 ff.

[10] Cf. Frankfort, *Studies* II 179 ff.

[11] Cf. Gautier and Lampre, *l. c.*

[12] See R. Campbell Thompson, *Archaeologia* LXX (1920) 109–124.

'Obeid,[13] and on the site of ancient Ur. The technique is more advanced than at Susa, but the decoration (almost exclusively geometric), and the dark-on-light color-scheme have led scholars to assume that the Mesopotamian pottery in question represents a later development of the ware found at Susa I; closely related to the Mesopotamian group is the fabric brought to light at Bender Bushire, on the Persian Gulf;[14] and as far east as Seistan, and even at Tell Kaudeni in Baluchistan, similar ware has been recently reported.[15] It may be added that the above communities were, as far as we know, copper-using.[16] The metallic types unearthed in southern Mesopotamia are the most advanced, and it is there that axe-heads with sockets or shaft-holes have been discovered in a considerable number of specimens.

Nor is the painted pottery of Mesopotamia confined to the south; in reality it is far more common in the north. I was able to trace in northern Iraq a long chain of mounds covered with painted pot-sherds, extending from the region of Kirkuk up to Mosul and on north towards the Turkish border.[17] The decoration on these sherds presents numerous analogies with the ware from the vicinity of Ur. At Tepe Gawra, east of the ruins of Khorsabad, I had the opportunity to study the painted pottery more thoroughly. In the course of a brief excavation in the autumn of 1927 we uncovered seven layers dating from the period of early painted ceramics.[18] Homologues of Susa, Musyan, and Ur were found, but with them also other types, which will be indicated later on. The surprising fact in connection with the period as represented at Gawra was the total absence of metal. However, it is not impossible to account for the lack of copper in the deepest strata at Gawra, by assuming that the metal was still too rare and precious to be scattered about everywhere. Perhaps the cemetery of Gawra I could supply more definite information on the subject. A detailed account of the excavation has since been published.[19]

---

[13] Cf. H. R. Hall and C. L. Woolley, *Excavations at Ur I: Al-'Ubaid* (London, 1927).

[14] Cf. M. Pézard, *Mission à Bender Bushire: MDEP* XV.

[15] Cf. the description in Frankfort, *Studies* II 184 ff.

[16] I have not been able to get a first-hand account of the finds from Seistan and I do not know whether any metal was found on that site.

[17] Cf. Speiser, "Preliminary Excavations at Tepe Gawra," *AASOR* IX (1929) 20 f.

[18] *Ib.*, 28 ff.

The westernmost representative of First Aeneolithic is up to the present Tell Zeidan, in Upper Syria.[20] In the north the farthest district to show ware related to Susian specimens is the region of Erivan, near Mount Ararat. More loosely connected than all of the preceding groups, but not necessarily isolated from them, are the types of painted pottery discovered at Samarra[21] north of Baghdad, at Urmia and Mohammedabad in north-western Persia, and in the lower strata at Anau, in Turkestan. The expansion is truly astonishing, yet the numerous interconnecting links help us to understand the distribution from a geographical point of view.[22] The comparative cultural homogeneity of this huge area, which is evident, now that we have so much material to be placed side by side, cannot be explained away by mere trade-relations. It presupposes a cultural relationship, and that in turn must go back to an underlying racial unity of at least the central territory; on the peripheries of the vast province copying and imitation may perhaps account for the similarities so far observed.

---

[19] *Ib.*, 17–94. Cf. especially p. 35. Attention must be called to the fact that only two trial trenches were sunk at Tepe Gawra. The absence of metal in the First Culture of Gawra (Gawra I), in which the painted pottery was well represented, may therefore be accidental, after all. On the other hand, copper objects were found in such profusion in the strata belonging to Gawra III as to make the total lack of metal in the preceding settlements very remarkable and noteworthy.

[20] Cf. Albright and Dougherty, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* (*BASOR*) 21. 12 ff. (1925); Albright, *Man* XXVI (1926) 25.

[21] Frankfort, *Studies* I 60 ff. The pottery from Samarra is assigned by Frankfort an intermediate position between that of Susa I and the ceramics from el-Obeid; cf. especially *Antiqu. J.* VIII 218, n. 2.

[22] Cf. Frankfort *ib.*, 219–220; in view of the wide dissemination of the pottery in question, the ware of Anau need no longer be considered as an isolated type of fabric.

I said central territory, though I am unable to qualify the term further. Geographically again, Susa is practically the center of gravity in First Aeneolithic. But is it really in Elam that the geometric decoration under discussion, and perhaps also the knowledge of metallurgy, were first introduced? This is, (or used to be) the view held by Dr. Frankfort.[23] I doubt if it can be defended in the light of the latest researches.

Frankfort himself pointed out that the latest specimens of Susa I show unmistakable connections with Armenia.[24] It is he also who recently joined the ranks of those scholars who look towards the Caucasus as the most likely home of metallurgy.[25] Studies of remains in the northern Caucasus have revealed that metals were known and worked in that region from very early times.[26] The probability that the early Susians brought with them from the north both their style of ornamentation and their knowledge of metals becomes increasingly strong with every new addition to our material on the subject.[27] The sporadic occurrences of stamp-seals at Susa I also point to the north-west since it is there that type was later most common (an engraved bead was also found at Gawra I).[28] Even the distribution of First Aeneolithic is simpler to follow if the original center is placed somewhere between Anatolia and the Caspian. Anau and the alleged Far Eastern homologues[29] could be reached more easily from the Caspian than from Elam; the same is equally true of Upper Mesopotamia.

---

[23] Cf. *Studies* I 32–34.

[24] *Ib.*, 36.

[25] *Antiqu. J* VIII 232–3.

[26] M. Rostovtzeff, *Iranians and Greeks in Southern Russia* 17 ff.

[27] Cf. Speiser, *Gawra* 43–4.

[28] *Ib.*, fig. 72.

An original center outside of Elam does not imply that all of the marvellous culture of Susa I was brought by the proto-Elamites from without. On the contrary, it is practically certain that the invaders proceeded to develop their style in their new home, until it reached a height not attained in any of the other branches of First Aeneolithic. The magnificent synthesis between the purely geometric and the stylized realistic motives was evidently consummated on strictly Elamite soil. On the other hand, the differences between, say, Susa I and Samarra or Seistan, are easily accounted for if we assume that all of them drew from a common source; they loom large if we have to derive from Elam proper the whole family of First Aeneolithic.

And the racial affiliations of those proto-Elamites? The answer, I believe, may once again be found with the aid of the material from Mesopotamia. At Ur and el-'Obeid aeneolithic deposits precede the earliest strata of what are indisputably Sumerian remains. The differences between these two civilizations are in most essential details so thorough-going that even original advocates of the unity-theory have had to abandon that view. The earliest Sumerians known to us produced undecorated pottery, used cylinder seals from the very beginning, and employed a characteristic type of script to record a language that up to the present stands completely isolated. Not one of these features can be paralleled at Susa I, or at related sites. Moreover, if the users of the early painted pottery of Babylonia were from the start Sumerians, it would follow inevitably that the populations of the remaining centers of First Aeneolithic were members of the same race. Thus a people hitherto confined to a section of Babylonia would suddenly be made to appear as the basic stock of a huge area extending from the head-waters of the Euphrates and the Tigris up to the water-shed of the Indus, a wholly inconceivable assumption.

---

[29] For a discussion of the possible connections of First Aeneolithic with the Far East see especially Frankfort, Studies II 189 f.

But we need not have recourse to exclusively negative arguments. It was demonstrated in the preceding chapter that the evidence of history, tradition, and philology, combined to define the prehistoric population of Babylonia as belonging to the Elamitic, or a related family. The overwhelming evidence of archaeology points now precisely in the same direction. It will have been also noted that the expansion of the linguistic group in question covers much of the territory assigned to the First Aeneolithic civilization. Archaeology has thus corroborated the conclusions based on epigraphic sources to an extent that is truly remarkable. To bring together once more the two independent lines of reasoning, philological sources on the one hand have furnished the proof that the pre-Sumerian population of Babylonia was Elamitic, or proto-Elamitic. On the other hand, archaeology has contributed the valuable information that the Mesopotamian branch of the First Aeneolithic culture also goes back to the pre-Sumerian population of the country. It follows conclusively that the Babylonian proto-Elamites and the users of the painted pottery of the Ur type were one and the same group, whose closest affinities were to be found at Susa. That the proto-Elamites should be identified with the civilization of Susa I will certainly cause no surprise.

Let us bear in mind the fact that the evidence for the comparative lateness of the arrival of the Sumerians in Mesopotamia is both archaeological and philological. Of late fresh attempts have been made to assign to the Sumerians an important part in the First Aeneolithic culture.[30] And by a strange turn of events, the scholar who has advanced these views was the first one to see most clearly that the Sumerians had had little to do with the painted pottery in question. Frankfort, who seems now to have gone over to the depleted Sumerian camp,[31] was evidently misled by some uncertain indications from Jemdet Nasr, which he accepted as established facts.[32] The finding of allegedly Sumerian records in conjunction with painted pottery, which Sumerians had not been supposed to possess, seems to have played havoc with a number of older theories. The matter must now be carefully examined. The subject belongs, chronologically, at least, to a period which may be called "Second Aeneolithic," to distinguish it from the previous phase of the painted-pottery culture.[33]

---

[30] R. C. Thompson held from the beginning that the painted pottery of Lower Mesopotamia was pre-Sumerian (cf. n. 12). In this view he was opposed by Hall and Woolley, cf. Al-'Ubaid 9. But Mr. Woolley has since changed his position. For some strange reason he now attributes the painter pottery to the Akkadians, cf. *The Sumerians* (Oxford, 1928) 12. Woolley also claims "that the Sumerian ware is older in time than the Elamite and belongs to a considerably earlier stage of development," *ib.*, 9–10, which is precisely the reverse of what is generally believed. As for the Akkadians, Woolley goes on to say (p. 12) that the probable occurrence of their pottery at Eridu and at Ur may mean that these Semites (Martu) "who, for all that their speech in historic times was Semitic, must have been of Asia Minor stock, pushed down further south than has been supposed. . . . " This is hardly a scientific way of stating the case; one cannot dispose of linguistic problems as summarily as all that. On the other hand, when Woolley says that "an Akkadian Mesopotamia preceded the incoming of the Sumerians, and that the division of the land as we know it later resulted from the driving back of its earliest rulers by invaders from the sea," he is, doubtless, on the right track.

[31] He now identifies the Sumerians with the homologues of Susa I, and draws the necessary conclusion that the Sumerian occupation extended originally as far as Tell Zeidan, in the middle-Euphrates area; cf. *Antiqu. J.* 228. It is a pity that Frankfort could not utilize the overwhelming philological evidence, which makes such a view impossible; in that case he would not have given up a position which he had done so much to establish.

[32] Cf. Langdon, "Ausgrabungen in Babylonien seit 1918," *AO* 26 (1928) 67 ff. Gadd, *HMU* 24, has placed the same value upon the finds from Jemdet Nasr, and his conclusion that the earliest traceable inhabitants of Sumer were no other than the Sumerians themselves, takes into account a small body of doubtful evidence to the exclusion of all the remaining linguistic and archaeological data.

Second Style. The First City of Susa was destined to give way to another settlement in which may be noted numerous elements that were absent from Susa I. The Second City appears in most places over a sterile layer of débris, which is not of uniform thickness. From this fact it is not advisable to make important historical deductions, to the effect that Susa remained deserted for a considerable length of time and that the later settlers had no direct contact with their predecessors.[34] The stratigraphic conditions observed may reflect no more than a change in the political state of affairs. Susa I may have succumbed to some powerful new group, evidently from without, and a complete rebuilding of the city resulted therefrom. At the same time, political clashes result inevitably in more intimate cultural contacts. Thus, much of the civilization of Susa I may have continued in the Second City as live and productive elements. The whole problem is indeed very complicated and still largely within the realm of speculation.[34a]

---

[33] Childe (*The Most Ancient East* 126) has introduced for the aeneolithic civilizations of the Near East the term "prediluvian" in harmony—he says—with Sumerian tradition. This name is not a very felicitous one; in fact, few designations could be more misleading. For while it is true that First Aeneolithic corresponds roughly with what the Sumerians considered as prediluvian, Second Aeneolithic is for the most part contemporary with the early Sumerian period, hence decidedly "post-diluvian." There is little use in introducing new names if they are not to be an improvement upon the older ones. Certainly, this is to be avoided in semi-popular works, whose prospective readers are not in a position to control the statements of the authors.

[34] So Frankfort, *Studies* I 34–36, 43–47. For a reply to Frankfort's statements cf. *RAR* XXIII 13 ff., where Pottier and de Mequenem have indicated that the intervening sterile layer cannot be used as a criterion for a prolonged desertion of the site.

[34a] Frankfort's interpretation of the career of Susa I is briefly this (*Studies*

We are in a better position to determine the new cultural elements that make their appearance in Susa II. Briefly, they consist of such innovations as theriomorphic or animal-shaped vases and weights, compartment vases, and cylinder seals, while the button-seals so rare in the preceding settlement now appear in great profusion. The pottery continues to be ornamented with painted designs, in this case often with an application of red together with the usual black; but the style of decoration has undergone a very marked change. As against the stylizing or abstract school of artists active in Susa I, we are confronted in the Second City with a distinctly realistic attitude.[35] Verisimilitude in every detail is now the guiding principle instead of the decorative effect of the whole.

The technique and the shapes are both more advanced than they were at Susa I. On the whole, it is obvious that we have in the second township a higher developed civilization, even though purely decorative arts have suffered a decline, doubtless under the pressure of more practical considerations. At some stage during that period—a precise indication of the sequence level is unfortunately impossible owing to the imperfect nature of the excavators' account—a semi-pictographic script makes its appearance. It is used for recording an early phase of the Elamite language, as is evident from the portions so far

---

I. 32 ff.): The First City was due to the settlement of a tribe of hunters, who were changing gradually into an agricultural mode of life. At first that group was comparatively isolated. Eventually, however, contacts with the north were encouraged, as the incipient desiccation thinned the wooded areas and made communications possible. At length, a period of drought resulted in the desertion of the site. This interesting theory, based largely on the views of J. L. Myres with regard to the influence of climatic conditions upon the progress of early civilizations (*CAH* I chs. I and II), operates with a comparatively small center and fails to consider adequately the actual expanse of the First Aeneolithic Culture. And, as Frankfort himself admits, we know very little about the synchronism between these assumed climatic conditions and the civilization in question.

[35] Frankfort, *o. c.* 40 ff.

deciphered. The script has only a partial resemblance to the earliest form of the Sumerian writing, out of which the later cuneiform signs developed.[36]

The connections of Susa II are almost exclusively with the west. As was the case with the preceding civilization, the first outpost is in the region of Musyan. The so-called "poteries des sepultures" cannot be separated from the polychrome jars of the second township. In the mound of Ali Abad, near Musyan, closely related polychrome vases were also unearthed in an undisturbed tomb.[37] Sumer proper has not yielded ceramic types that may be definitely linked with Susa II, but further north the Second Aeneolithic culture is represented by a small number of sherds from Fara, and especially by numerous finds from Jemdet Nasr, near Kish.[38] Polychrome pottery, theriomorph vases, a considerable number of seals, or in short, remains typical of the Second Style, have been recently discovered in what seem to be ruins of an important dwelling. Most significant was the finding at Jemdet Nasr of about 150 pictographic tablets, apparently in close conjunction with the above objects. We are imperfectly advised as to the precise position of these important finds, since the complete archaeological account has not yet been published. However, from the little that we do know it is quite clear that the site was comparatively late. The evidence is supplied by the type of bricks used at Jemdet Nasr. Langdon has expressly stated that the building in which his finds were made was constructed of rectangular bricks.[39] In Sumer the shape of bricks is a fairly reliable criterion of date, as far as the early sites are

[36] Cf. Scheil, *MDEP* XVII, and Frank, *RV* III 83–84.

[37] *MDEP* VIII 73 ff.

[38] Cf. Langdon in *AO* 26. 67 ff.

[38] *Ib.* 72. Cf. also the remarks of Christian and Weidner in *AfO* V 147 ff. They emphasize the important point that the connections of Jemdet Nasr are clearly with the civilization of Susa II.

concerned: the oldest buildings were made of plano-convex bricks, while the rectangular shape does not come in until the period of the Lagashite kings; it was evidently a later improvement. This fact brings down the date of Jemdet Nasr well into the third millennium. Obviously, that site can have no bearing whatsoever upon the First Aeneolithic period of Mesopotamia, which must be assigned in its entirety to the fourth millennium, antedating as it does the First Dynasty of Ur. Even if we assume, therefore, that the makers of the Jemdet Nasr ware, or in other words the people of the Second Aeneolithic culture, were Sumerians,[40] it would affect in no wise the identity of the users of First Aeneolithic pottery. The chronological difference alone is much too serious for that.

But are we really certain that the Sumerians produced the painted pottery of Jemdet Nasr, in spite of the fact that their typical ware is always unpainted? For the present the problem is still far from settled. It is true that pictographic tablets were discovered,[41] apparently in conjunction with the painted pottery. Unfortunately, we do not know definitely who the writers of those archaic tablets were, nor what was the language that they used. Langdon believes that we are dealing here with Sumerians,[42] but his assumption still remains to be substantiated by more convincing arguments than he has been able to adduce to date. On the other hand, no less an authority on Sumerian than Thureau-Dangin has come out with the statement that the writers of the Jemdet Nasr documents were non-Sumerians. His conclusion is based on the numerical system preserved in those documents, a system that can be followed, owing to the peculiarities of the script, even though the character of the language is still uncertain. As is well known, the Sumerians used the sexagesimal mode of counting, while the decimal system has been found in Elamitic records. Now the records from Jemdet Nasr do not use the sexagesimal system as we should expect in Sumerian documents, but employ instead decimal numbering.[43] The presumption, therefore, would be that the language of the Jemdet Nasr tablets was also Elamitic; especially so since the accompanying remains are closely related to those of Susa II, where a pictographic script was known as well.[44] For the present, however, it would be unwise to go to the other extreme. The pictographs of Susa, for one, have only a remote resemblance to those of Kish.[45] The whole problem must be left as undecided. In the meantime it is entirely unwarrantable and misleading to base far-reaching conclusions on the identity of the writers of the Jemdet Nasr texts.[45a]

---

[40] Christian and Weidner (*l. c.*) do not take a definite stand as regards the racial identity of the people of Jemdet Nasr, which is doubtless a wise position. They do, however, make it clear that, in their opinion, both Jemdet Nasr and Fara were strongly influenced by the non-Sumerian peoples from the East. My own conclusions are very much the same, except for one point. According to Christian and Weidner, the Gutians were probably the carriers of the Second Aeneolithic culture, whereas to my thinking that rôle is to be assigned to the Hurrians, as will be demonstrated in ch. V. Christian's theories about the Gutians (cf. his article, "Das erste Auftreten der Indogermanen in Vorderasien," in the *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* (*MAGW*) LVIII (1928) 210–229) are based on untenable premises. That the Gutians were "fair-complexioned" is nothing but a myth, as I believe to have amply established in ch. IV. The suggestion that the stylistic changes which were introduced with Second Aeneolithic should be attributed to the "Aryans," of whom the Gutians are alleged to have been a branch (*ib*), a view which was already indicated in *MAGW* LIV (1924), 40 ff., is emphatically rejected by Matz, *Die frühkretischen Siegel* 57, n. 4.

[41] Recently published by Langdon in *OECT* VII (1928) entitled, *Pictographic Inscriptions from Jemdet Nasr.*

---

[42] *Ib., Introduction.*

[43] So Thureau-Dangin in *RA* XXIV 29.

[44] These similarities are summed up conveniently in *AfO* V 149.

[45] Recent discoveries in Hither Asia have placed the problem of the origin of writing in that part of the world in an entirely new light. Hitherto it has been practically an axiom that the Sumerians are to be credited with the invention of the form of writing, which ultimately developed into the cuneiform system. At present, the question does not admit of so simple a solution. For while the rulers of the First Dynasty of Ur use a script that is clearly a prototype of the later cuneiform, the contemporary, or even later, systems of writing current in Elam and at Jemdet Nasr, are considerably different and far less removed from their pictographic originals. It appears, then, that at the beginning of the

---

third millennium, two distinct traditions of writing were represented in Mesopotamia: the abstract signs used at Ur and at Lagash, and the semi-pictographic characters of Elam and the district of Kish. The practical contemporaneity of the two scripts precludes the possiblity that the one was developed out of the other; otherwise, the presumption would be that the Sumerian writing, which grew out of earlier pictographs (cf. Barton, *The Origin and Development of Babylonian Writing*, Leipzig, 1913) owes its origin to the proto-Elamites or the people of Jemdet Nasr. It will be difficult, in the present circumstances, to avoid the assumption that the two scripts in question were derived from a common source; only, the Sumerians were quicker in departing from the pictographic prototypes than the other group. And lastly, it must be borne in mind that a semi-pictographic script has also been brought to light during recent excavations in the Indus valley. The latter system has no direct connection with the Mesopotamian forms, except for a limited number of general resemblances (cf. the study of Barton "On the so-called Sumero-Indian seals," *AASOR* VIII 79–95). Even Chinese script has been brought into the discussion, not without some show of reason, cf. Ungnad, "Sumerische und chinesische Schrift," *WZKM* XXXIV (1927) 76–86. The entirely unexpected expanse of the aeneolithic painted pottery has furnished proof that intercourse between the Near and the Far East must be traced back to prehistoric times. In view of this, it is not at all beyond the range of possibility that all the systems of writing indicated above have more than accidental similarities in common. If a common source be assumed, the problem still remains as to the original location of that center: nor can anything be said concerning the people to whom the invention of proto-cuneiform writing would thus be credited. It may have been the pro-ethnic Japhethites, and then it may have been the people who were later to constitute the Sumerian strain in Mesopotamia; and finally, there is the possibility of some other, unknown ethnic group. We are here entirely in the dark, and no conclusion either way can as yet be suggested. But in view of the possible bearing of these problems upon the main subject of this study, the present status of the question had to be briefly outlined.

[45a] While the present study was in proof there appeared an exhaustive review of Langdon's book, contributed to *OLZ* 1930: 438–47 by C. Frank. The latter's long preoccupation with the Elamite pictographs makes his views on this subject particularly valuable. It is Frank's opinion that the language of the Jemdet Nasr tablets is indeed Sumerian. He doubts, however, whether their writers were Sumerians in the ethnic sense of the term. The long-established theory that the Sumerians invented the cuneiform writing, or rather the script from which cuneiform developed, is viewed with even greater scepticism.

Let us, however, assume for the moment, and only for the sake of argument, that the tablets found by Langdon were actually written in Sumerian. What would this prove? Certainly we cannot look to Kish for the earliest Sumerian population. Akkad must have received the bulk of the pre-Sumerians, as we have seen, following the Sumerian conquest. The Semites were there at least not later than the Sumerians, as will be presently shown. The ethnic conditions in northern Babylonia were, no doubt, quite complicated in the earliest Sumerian period. Are we, in these circumstances, to expect in an Akkadian site the prototype of the Sumerian writing? Then there is also the chronological difficulty. Jemdet Nasr is hardly anterior to the First Dynasty of Ur, yet in the latter place Sumerians used different pottery, another type of script, and an altogether unrelated numerical system. Such differences would pre-suppose centuries of development, assuming that the earlier stage is represented at Jemdet Nasr. The difficulties are practically insurmountable, and it is much better not to sponsor an untenable theory that is based on such flimsy and doubtful evidence. At best, we may have at Jemdet Nasr some type of Sumerian, spoken by a non-Sumerian population which was culturally related to the Second City of Susa and employed a script that had been borrowed from an unknown source. But with such speculations we enter the domain of metaphysics.

To return to the distribution of the Second Aeneolithic culture, similarities have been noted between the painted pottery of Susa II and a certain class of ware that is found in Palestine

---

Frank's final conclusion is that both the Sumerian and early Elamite scripts go back to a pre-Sumerian prototype which is virtually the hypothesis advocated in the above pages. Cf. already Legrain, *MDEP* XVII 9, 10. The belief that there was a close connection between Kish, Susa, and the Indus Valley, is also expressed by the reviewer. Langdon's suggestion that the Jemdet Nasr folk were monotheists is rightly rejected as fanciful.

towards the middle of the third millennium.[46] A connection has also been suggested between the polychrome wares of Susa, Musyan, and Kish, on the one hand, and certain north Syrian and eastern Anatolian specimens on the other. More conclusive is the spread throughout all of the above districts of characteristic theriomorph vases, and the popularity of the stamp-seals. The cylinder seals of the entire area also show numerous similarities, but an argument of this kind may give rise to a justified scepticism as to its validity.[47] To help bridge the geographical gap between the eastern and the western groups, we have, finally, numerous polychrome specimens from Tepe Gawra; some of them link up definitely with Jemdet Nasr and with Kish, while others point just as umistakably to Anatolia. It is significant that at Gawra there is no chronological difference between the ceramic homologues of Susa I and Susa II.[48] Theriomorph vases are, however, absent at Gawra; evidently we have there an early forerunner of the pottery which at a later age combined with animal-shaped vases and seals to form the Second Aeneolithic culture in northern Syria, in Akkad, and in Elam.

The original center of the Second Style is no less difficult to determine than it was in the case of the First Style. Here, too, the available evidence points northwards, where our threads are ultimately lost in an ill-explored territory. One geographic difference is worth observing. First Aeneolithic became specialized in the eastern part of the Near East, while Second Aeneolithic gravitates decidedly westwards. The former centers on the Iranian plateau and reaches out as far as Baluchistan and even China. The latter remains for a long time at home in northern Syria, and it embraces in the Hyksos period Egypt, Cyprus, and Cappodocia.[49] The difference in time is more difficult to determine. At Gawra are found fabrics that enter into the composition of both cultures. On the whole, however, the Second Style is demonstrably later than the First, and it persists in Elam late into the third millennium, on the Levantine coast even as late as the second millennium.

---

[46] For the most recent account of the diffusion of the Second Aeneolithic civilization (Frankfort's "Lowland Culture") see Frankfort, *Antiqu. J.* VIII 217 ff.

[47] The latest study of the relevant glyptic material is furnished by Matz, *Die frühkretischen Siegel;* cf. especially ch. V of that work, where the literature is also listed (p. 52).

[48] I do not wish to imply thereby that Gawra has yielded actual specimens of the Second Aeneolithic period. For even the two representations of water-birds, pictured in Speiser, *Gawra,* figs. 43–44, are not typically naturalistic. But the use of polychrome decoration and the employment of the metope-arrangement are elements that entered prominently, at a later period, into the composition of the fabrics characteristic of the Second Aeneolithic.

Unfortunately, we cannot avoid touching upon the controversial problem as to the ethnic carriers of the Second Aeneolithic culture. How troublesome the question is may be gathered from the fact that the solution has been entrusted, among others, to so widely differing elements as Semitic and Indo-European. The latter explanation[50] is largely based on one of the most amusing slips of modern philology, as I hope to demonstrate in the following chapter. The Semitic theory has been pressed by Frankfort, whose clear analysis of the available material has shed so much light upon the whole problem of ancient Near Eastern civilizations. He distinguishes between a Highland and a Lowland Culture, which correspond to First and Second Aeneolithic. The distinction is rather inexact and misleading, since the two civilizations cannot be localized in mountains and plains; moreover it presupposes a highland and lowland origin for the respective cultures, and this is for the present begging the question. As the carriers of the "Lowland Culture" Frankfort has suggested the Semites.[51]

---

[49] See especially Frankfort, *l. c.*

[50] Christian, *MAGW* LVIII 218 ff.

[51] Cf. note 46.

On the face of it, it is quite reasonable to make the Semites responsible for *spreading* the Second Aeneolithic civilization in Syria, Palestine, and as far east as Akkad. However, it requires more imagination than is consistent with strictly scientific method to presuppose Semites, or even "Semitized Syrians" in Elam, Cappadocia and in Cyprus over the long period in which the culture is traceable. I believe that the solution is to be found elsewhere.

At Gawra there is an intermediate stratum interposed between the painted-pottery civilization and a period under Sumero-Akkadian influence.[52] That middle stratum may be plausibly assigned to Semites; it has yielded an imposing body of remains, but among them there is not a single sherd of painted pottery. The decorated ware belongs entirely to the preceding stratum. It has been indicated that the painted pottery of Gawra consists of both monochrome and polychrome specimens, and that it shows contacts with the two aeneolithic cultures. The only possible conclusion from these facts is that the ethnic affiliations of both civilizations lie within one larger group. This theory has in its favor much more than the evidence from a single out-of-the-way site. It reconciles the two opposing schools built around the two civilizations of Susa. For the indisputable differences between Susa I and Susa II may be explained on this theory as the result of two waves of immigration into Susa, which started from a common center at different periods.[53] While Susa I was developing its amazing civilization, numerous developments occurred in the postulated northern center, which resulted in the changes reflected at Susa II. The equally numerous similarities need, on our assumption, no explanation whatever. Certainly, no such rigid line can be drawn between the abstract and the realistic styles, as Dr. Frankfort suggests. That the one may shade into the other in some respects is admitted by Frankfort himself.

---

[52] Speiser, *l. c.* 30–35, and 47–49.

[53] For a similar view, cf. Contenau, *Manuel d'archéologie orientale* 414.

Even more favorable to this assumption of a common center (between Anatolia and the Caspian) is the agreement between the philological and the archaeological data on the subject. That the Near East was occupied by a fairly uniform ethnic family is a theory that has guided the present work so far; it has been substantiated for Elam and a large part of Mesopotamia, and it will be further developed in the following chapters. I may be pardoned for anticipating the results at this point for the purpose of stating that a uniform ethnic group, the Hurrians, can be established for practically the whole of the territory assigned to Second Aeneolithic. In view of these arguments, it is needless to resort to the far-fetched theory of the Semitic origin of the Second Culture, or to the no less improbable hypothesis that Semites played a leading part in spreading that culture. The two aeneolithic civilizations overlap over a vast area. This fact is very satisfactorily explained by the comparative ethnic homogeneity of the provinces in question. And the differences between the cultures are amply accounted for by the distance in time which is known to have separated them in most of the places where they have been found together.

It remains now to return to Lower Mesopotamia and to attempt to disentangle the several cultures that crowd the country at the beginning of its history. We have seen that in this district the civilizations of First and Second Aeneolithic, as well as that of the Sumerians, are all distinct one from the other. In addition to the above, there is a fourth element, the Semites, an element that cannot be assigned definitely to any of the early Mesopotamian cultures, though it probably partook of them all to a large degree. This is certainly true of the Sumerian civilization, which ultimately comes to be known for that very reason as Sumero-Akkadian. The situation is not unnatural. The earliest Semites that are likely to have discovered the blessings of the rich alluvial soil in the Valley of the Two Rivers, must have been nomads from the south. Now nomads do not have a culture that is comparable to that of settled communities; hence they are compelled to borrow from the latter on adopting for themselves a sedentary mode of living. The Semites who were in a position to bring with them to Lower Mesopotamia a tradition of settled habits could have come only from Syria. What that tradition may have been, we cannot tell at present. At all events, we cannot point out in the archaeological remains of Babylonia contributions that are distinctly Semitic until we reach the period of the Dynasty of Agade. Isolated features, such as dress and treatment of the hair, cannot by themselves constitute an independent culture. They do, however, call attention, when adequately evaluated, to the presence of an additional element. It was primarily upon the presence of bearded figures in the earliest human representations from Sumer, that Meyer based his theory of the very early arrival of Semites in Mesopotamia: the Sumerians did not grow beards as a rule.[54] From the internal evidence of Sumerian religion, Meyer then proceeded to deduce that the Sumerians followed the Semites into the country. Such evidence alone would not be sufficient to establish the point in the light of the latest researches. But additional proof has been accumulating recently. This is not the place to go into details, but I may add that Poebel, who is one of the foremost students of the Sumerian language, has been able to point out recently numerous Semitic loan-words in the Sumerian of a very early period, which to him constitutes important evidence of Semitic priority.[55] Further support for the same view I believe to have found at Tepe Gawra. There the Semitic stratum contained none of the characteristically Sumerian remains; a typically Sumero-Akkadian period was found, however, above the "Semitic" levels.[56] It is true that Tepe Gawra is a site in northern Iraq; nevertheless, it seemed possible to conclude from the materials used in the construction of the "Semitic" shrine at Gawra, that the building reflected typically Babylonian conditions, and that its builders must have come, consequently, from the south. It would follow that if the Semites preceded the Sumerians at Gawra, they could not have done otherwise in southern Mesopotamia.

---

[54] E. Meyer, *Sumerer und Semiten in Babylonien* (Berlin, 1906). For a recent discussion on that subject see the similarly entitled article by Meissner, *AfO* V 1–10.

[55] *ZA* XXXIX 149, n. 2.

To turn now to less elusive matters, we shall endeavor to differentiate geographically as well as chronologically between the three early and well-established Mesopotamian cultures indicated above. It has been shown that the earliest civilization on the spot was a product of the First Aeneolithic group. It appears to have been localized in Sumer proper, since no remains of it have been discovered in Akkad. The carriers of that civilization were proto-Elamites, or related tribes, and they have also left numerous remains further north, in the regions east of the Tigris.[57] In Sumer their center was in the district of Eridu and Ur, and it is probable that the district in question was colonized from Elam proper.

Then, probably towards the end of the fourth millennium, the political map of Elam and Mesopotamia undergoes radical changes. We note the disappearance of First Aeneolithic from Sumer, and the destruction of the first township at Susa. It is not improbable that the two events were contemporaneous, and that they were both due to the same source. That source could have been one of two things: either the arrival of the Sumerians, or else the invasion of the exponents of the

---

[56] Speiser, *l. c.*, 47–48.

[57] *Ib.* 20, and *BASOR* 28 (1927) 13 ff.

Second Aeneolithic civilization; perhaps the two events occurred at the same time.

At any rate, the proto-Elamites of Sumer are supplanted by the Sumerians, while the second township of Susa is built upon the ruins of the first settlement. A synthesis of the two civilizations of Susa was possible, as both elements seem to have been fairly homogeneous. In Sumer the invaders had little in common with the ethnic substratum of the land, and a distinct cvilization resulted. Wherever the Sumerians may have come from,[58] they entered the land at the head of the Persian

---

[58] For a recent discussion concerning the original home of the Sumerians see Barton, "Whence came the Sumerians?" in *JAOS* 49. 263–268. The author considers it likely, though by no means certain, that the home-land of the Sumerians was in Oman. It may be added that Childe (*The Most Ancient East* 230 ff.) also looks to Arabia for an old cultural center, though his arguments appear to me singularly unconvincing. Personally, I find that the view of Hall, who would connect the Sumerians with the Dravidian family (whose languages also belong to the agglutinative group) carries as much conviction, or as little, as any other theory on the subject; cf. R. H. Hall, *Ancient History of the Near East* 173 f. The discovery of an old civilization on the Indus, which certainly had contacts with early Sumer (cf. Smith, *EHA* 50)—though we must not assume at present that the peoples were ethnically related—lends added color to Hall's hypothesis. Unfortunately, we do not know where the Dravidians originated; they are admittedly not indigenous to India.

In looking for the home-land of the Sumerians, we cannot lose sight of the remarkable finds from Transcaspia, which Rostovtzeff has recently brought again to the attention of the scientific world; cf. his article on the "Sumerian Treasure from Astrabad," *JEA* VI (1920), 1–27. He has shown that, while the persons depicted on the Astrabad bowl bear a most striking resemblance to the early Sumerians (of the period of Urnina), the Astrabad weapons are quite distinct from those of Mesopotamia. The finds in question cannot, therefore, be regarded as an importation from Sumer, but they must be looked upon as a local product. The same scholar has also pointed out the similarity between the silver vases from Maikop, in the Caucasus area, and the celebrated silver vase of Entemena of Lagash; cf. *Iranians and Greeks* 23 f., and pl. III; for the Lagash vase see de Sarzec-Heuzey, *Découvertes en Chaldée* II pl. 43 *bis*. It is very noteworthy that the Caucasian vases are more primitive than the delicate piece from Lagash; borrowing from Mesopotamia is again out of the question. These scattered bits make it appear possible that the original home of the Sumerian may have been in Transcaspia; it is also far from unlikely that the

Gulf. The people of the Second Aeneolithic culture arrived probably from the north-west and settled in Akkad without penetrating further south.

It is very instructive to consider this juxtaposition of the two disparate civilizations facing each other on the border line between Sumer and Akkad. Being contemporaneous for a long period of time, they overlap in many cultural details, without either sacrificing its individuality. They have similar cylinder seals, identical statuettes, weapons, and the like. But at the same time they use different types of pottery, and employ diverse scripts for their respective languages. Similar conditions prevailed in the case of Elam and Sumer. It is not likely that the scripts in question were invented independently, presupposing as they each do so complicated a succession of similar stages of development. A common source must be regarded as certain, though what that source was we cannot tell yet. Subsequently the scripts developed along separate lines in the employ of different ethnic groups.[59]

The simultaneous arrival from opposite directions of both the Sumerians and the Jemdet Nasr folk, explains immediately their respective distribution in later times. The people of the Second Aeneolithic civilization may have encountered little opposition on their way to Elam, but they were not equal to the task of displacing the highly civilized Sumerians who occupied the southern districts. In Akkad, where they had found a kindred population, the pottery-painters of the second phase were able to maintain themselves for some time in opposition to the Sumerians. The eventual Sumerization of northern Babylonia is not much more than superficial; that ancient

---

Dravidians came originally from Central Asia. If these views should be substantiated by future finds, many difficult problems of the oldest known period of Hither Asia would be automatically cleared. But we must not lose ourselves in these fascinating, but extremely uncertain, details.

[59] Cf. note 45.

melting-pot was soon to become the source of Semitic strength.

It is hardly necessary to add that the comparatively late arrival of the Sumerians in Mesopotamia affects in no way the importance of their contributions to the sum of human culture. It is well known to what extent religion, arts, and letters, of later times bear witness to the influence of the Sumerians.[60] Numerous Sumerian loanwords in Akkadian, and in other Semitic languages as well, are no less indicative of the cultural supremacy of the Sumerians. If the Akkadians, the Aramaeans, and the Hebrews, employed cognates of the same Sumerian word for 'chair' (*guza*), and if even to-day the Arabs still use the Sumerian word for 'carpenter' (*nagar*), it is quite evident from what source many of the crafts and their products spread over the ancient world.[61] Chronological priority is, of course, a matter apart. In a very similar way, the value of the superb Hellenic civilization is not diminished in the slightest by the fact that the Greeks were apparently the third ethnic stock in the land. But, to continue the analogy, just as the Greeks superseded another highly developed civilization, the Sumerians found on their arrival in Mesopotamia a culture of considerable attainments.

---

[60] The mistake is sometimes made of judging the physical characteristics of the Sumerians from the statuettes of the Gudea period. This is hardly justified. No one can compare carefully the family relief of Urnina with the numerous sculptural representations of Gudea cf. also Hall, *o.c.*, pl. XII, without realizing that the physical type of the Lagash rulers underwent marked changes during the intervening centuries. Nor is this in the least surprising. The invading Sumerians could scarcely have been more than a prominent minority from the very beginning (cf. Barton, *JAOS* 49. 268). In course of time their somatic characteristics were considerably affected by the other ethnic groups. (Nevertheless it is impossible to look at the Copenhagen statue of Gudea [cf. Meissner, *Könige Babyloniens und Assyriens*, opp. p. 36] without finding it more or less Mongoloid.) As for the results based on the examination of skulls found at Kish and el-Obeid, they are as yet uncertain and inconclusive; cf. especially the criticism of v. Bissing, *AfO* V 77, n. 1.

[61] For Sumerian loanwords in other languages cf. Zimmern, *Akkadische Fremdwörter* (Leipzig, 1917) 84, under "Sumerisch."

Now that the archaeological background for our inquiry has been described, we may turn to the other neighbors of Sumer and Akkad, who still remain to be discussed. First in order are several near neighbors of Elam.

CHAPTER IV

THE LULLU AND THE GUTI

IN ORDER to study the neighbors of Elam, and their ethnic affiliations, we shall follow the Zagros range, to the north and north-east of Elam. The people in question are essentially mountaineers and the Zagros appears to have been their immediate home. It will be remembered that the Sumerian name for Elam signifies 'highland,' and that the First Aeneolithic culture, which attained the apogee of its development at Susa, has also been termed the "Highland Culture."

The investigation will again proceed from what relevant historical information we possess to the study of proper names, especially place-names. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that in connection with the geographical terms our inquiry is not topographical but rather toponymic. The evaluation of the available material for topographic purposes is still in its infancy, and fresh geographical indications come up with almost every new publication of cuneiform records. The present writer was made keenly aware of the difficulties inherent in the identification of sites in the Zagros area, in connection with his essay on "Southern Kurdistan," which was primarily devoted to Assyrian campaigns in the Lullu country. Incidentally, the Lullu will be the first to claim our attention in this chapter.

An interesting comment on the countries to be discussed is found in a text which seems to indicate the authorship of Hammurabi. The document was discovered at Ur, and it has been published in a recent volume of inscriptions from that site. Among others, we are told of the king's efforts against "the man of Elam?, of Gutium, of Subartu, (and) of Tukrish, whose mountains are distant, whose languages are complicated."[1] This statement sets the stage for us most admirably. The Lullu are not included in the above enumeration, but the term Gutium undoubtedly covers the omission. The extensive material on the Subartu problem is discussed in the following chapter. For the present we may confine ourselves, therefore, to the Lullu, the Guti, and their immediate neighbors.

The Lullu. It is impossible to indicate with any degree of precision the boundaries of the land of the Lullu, or the Lullubi, as they are known to have called themselves; all we do know is that the heart of the country was in the valley of Shehrizor, in the modern district of Sulaimania. This is established by a variety of sources. A much-disputed geographical account of the extent of the first Semitic empire of Sargon of Agade, mentions the Lullubi immediately after Arrapha.[2] This location is confirmed by the documents from Arrapha (Kirkuk tablets), since the Lullu appear in those records as near neighbors from the east, that is to say, from the region of Sulaimania. From Ashurnasirpal's account of the campaigns against Zamua we learn the position of several Lullu cities, which have been identified in the same district.[3] And lastly, a relief recently discovered in a pass to the south of Shehrizor represents Naram-Sin as victorious over the Lullubi; the relief is clearly the prototype of Naram-Sin's famous stele.[4]

From Shehrizor the Lullu appear to have spread to the south-eastern district of Halman, which centered around modern Zohab, near Ser-i-pul. This may be gathered from the relief of the Lullu king Annubanini,[5] which was discovered at Zohab. The land in question is no longer that of the Lullu proper, but an adjoining district that is usually listed separately. The enterprising Annubanini probably conquered the kindred tribe of Halman, or Arman[6] as it is often called, and he celebrated the feat by setting up several reliefs. The one that is so far available for study bears, among others, a brief inscription written in a rather barbarous kind of Akkadian. The contents are essentially non-committal. Judging from the character of the writing, Annubanini could not have ruled long after the time of Naram-Sin, who had prided himself so much on his victory of the Lullu. It was probably during this short-lived submission to Akkad that the Lullu learned the little Akkadian they knew; this superficial Semitization was just as ineffectual a disguise of the non-Semitic character of the people as was the name of the king himself, which in reality represents the Elamite god Hanubani or Humban.[7] It is not very hazardous to suppose that the invasion of Akkad by the Guti gave Annubanini his opportunity to free his land from the foreign rule.

---

[1] Cf. the bilingual inscription, *URI* 146, cols. III and IV 1–5.

[2] *KAV* 92. 10–11, and Albright's commentary to the entire text in *JAOS* 45. 193–245.

[3] Cf. Speiser, *AASOR* VIII (1928) 1–42.

[4] The relief was discovered in the pass known as Derbend-i-Gawr, in the district of Qaradagh (south of Sulaimania, cf. map in *AASOR* VIII 42) by C. J. Edmonds; cf. his note in the *Geographical Journal* LXV 63–4 (with plate), entitled "Two Ancient Monuments in Kurdistan." See also Smith, *EHA* 97.

---

[5] For the text of that inscription see *MDEP* IV pl. XII. For transliteration and translation see now Barton, *RISA* 150–151. The relief is discussed by Hüsing, *Zagros* 16 ff; according to Hüsing, the name *Annunbanini* is connected with the Elamite god Humban/Umman (*ib.*, 18). Another relief from the same district, recently recopied by Herzfeld (cf. his "Reisebericht," *ZDMG* LXXX (1926) 232) bears the name of *Tar-dun-ni*; the suffix is the same as in *Annubanini*, thus bearing out the contention of Hüsing that the name of the latter is non-Semitic. The two reliefs in question are said to be of the same period. A certain king Anu-banini is mentioned in the mythological text about the king of Kuta (the sacred city of Nergal); it is not very likely, however, that the two names referred to the same person, for all the similarity in sound; at all events, the mythological allusion is obscure. Cf. Jensen, *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek* (*KB*) VI 292. 21, and see note on p. 552 of the same work; see also Ebeling, in Gressmann's *Altorientalische Texte zum alten Testament* (1926) 232, and note *b*.

[6] Cf. Albright, *l. c.*, 212.

[7] Hüsing, *l. c.*, and *OLZ* 1907, 234–5.

In the annals of the kings of Assyria the Lullu are mentioned sporadically, generally in conjunction with the Guti, the Kassites, and the Shubaru. Historically their contacts with Mesopotamia are merely incidental. After the Naram-Sin episode we hear comparatively little of the political situation in the land, until Ashurnasirpal is compelled, almost two thousand years later, to use all his resources in order to quell a rebellion in Zamua, which is a later geographic term for the country of the Lullu. It is possible, however, that Assyria had kings of Lullu origin in the 18th century B. C., and probably even in the 19th.[8]

As regards the language of the Lullu, Hüsing has shown in numerous minor publications that it belongs clearly to the Elamitic group.[9] To be sure, we have only a limited number of proper names to judge from; but the phonetics and the terminations of these valuable remnants are sufficiently distinctive and unambiguous.

---

[8] The kings in question were Adasi, Lubai(?), Bazai, and Lullai, cf. Weidner, "Die grosse Königsliste aus Assur," *AfO*, III 70. 1–7, and Nassouhi, "Grande liste de rois d'Assyrie," *AfO* IV. 4, col. 2. 17–19. It is obvious that none of the above names is Semitic. The suffix *-si*, as in Adasi, is very common as we have seen in Lullu place-names. Since it is, however, inadvisable to confuse place-names with personal names, no deductions can be based on the name of Adasi; but it may be added that a sibilant suffix without the overhanging vowel is found in the personal names of the Gutians and the Kassites. As for the remaining three names, Albright has shown in *JSOR*, VIII (1924), 54–55, that the suffix which they have in common is really a gentilic termination; consequently *Lullai̯* must mean 'the man of Lullu.' *Bazai̯* (formerly read Zimzai by mistake) signifies, then, 'the man of Bazu.' Smith (*EHA* 208) notes that there were two places named Bazu (or Baṣu), one on the Euphrates, the other east of Assyria; he inclines to identify Bazai with the former. However, Bazai is the son of Lullai (cf. *AfO*, IV 3. 21), and if the latter is 'the man of Lullu,' Bazu must also be sought east of Assyria. The reading *Lubai̯* is uncertain (Sabai, cf. Albright, *l. c.*, is wrong); a place Lubba has been connected with Urarṭu (cf. *ZA* XIV 116), but this location seems to be too far north for our purposes. Albright's interpretation of Lullai makes it probable that the other kings in question were also of Lullubian origin.

[9] Cf. especially *Zagros* 19 ff.

It will be recalled that the following suffixes were found to be characteristic of the Elamitic area: *-k*, *-r*, *-s*, and (*a*)*n* (all of them with or without overhanging vowels); and a labial ending (*-p* or *-b*) was noted as a plural formative. Now all these suffixes are prominent in Lullu names, especially in place-names.

Thus we have the mountain-range *Sim-aki*[10] in Zamua (Lulluland). Next to that range is the ridge of *Az-iru* (modern Azmir).[11] The *-r* ending is indeed very common. An oft-mentioned range is that of *Kull-ar*, "high mountains of the country of the Lulumū, also called the country of Zamua."[12] The stele of Annubanini was set up on Mount *Bat-ir*.[13] Then we have the river *Ed-ir*, the cities *Zam-ri* and *Bā-ri*, the country *Lā-ra*, the mountains of *Lal-ar*, the pass of *Hašm-ar*, etc.[14] The sibilant endings have already been mentioned in connection with *Barahsi*. The latter was a border district of Elam and it reached doubtless to the southern outposts of the Lullu territories. We may add here the fortress *Uzi*[15] which lay at the western entrance into Zamua (in the famous pass of Babite). The name *Bun-asi* is also found in the writing *Buna-is*, showing that the consonant only was really significant in the suffixes.[16] As for the ending (*a*)*n*, we have the Zamuan city *Hudu-n*,[17] the mountain *Su-ani*,[18] the river

---

[10] Ashurnasirpal, *Annals* 2. 52 ff. For the position of Simaki see *AASOR* VIII 28.

[11] *Ib.*

[12] Cf. Thureau-Dangin, *Une relation de la huitiéme campagne de Sargon* (Paris, 1912), pl. I, 11. For the topography of Kullar see *AASOR* VIII, 18 f.

[13] Barton, *RISA* 150.

[14] Cf. *AASOR* VIII 15 ff.

[15] *Ib.*

[16] *Ib.*, 16. To the same group belong the Lullu cities *Mesu* and *Arzizu*, *l. c.* 21. It is interesting that *Arzizza* is a very common personal name of the Hurrian group, where place-names with the same ending also occur. The fact is worth noting that it is not always possible to keep the two types of names apart.

[17] *Ib.*, 26. The place *Adamdun*, a neighbor of Awan (cf. ch. II, note 24), has the same termination as *Hudun*.

[18] *AASOR* VIII 27.

Rad-ānu,[19] and the land which is written *Halma-an* or *Arm-an*, and even *Alm-an* and *Ialm-an*. Here we get a glimpse of the phonetic peculiarities of the local dialects. The initial consonant was apparently beyond the powers of the Mesopotamian scribes to render with any approximation to the real sound: it was evidently a spirant, as may be gathered from the writings with *h*, but it was also palatalized as the spelling *Ialma-an* would indicate.[20] Equally significant is in the same name the interchange of the liquids (*r* and *l*). We observe it again in *Hualsindu* as compared with *Parsindu*;[21] indeed the variation is characteristic of the whole area of the Central Zagros, and it is also observable in Hurrian territory. In the light of these facts it may not be amiss to reconsider the dialectal forms found for the old Mesopotamian cities Ur and Uruk. The variants give us *Ilib* (for *Urim*, which is the full form, hence comparisons with Semitic roots are out of the question), and *Illab/k*[22] (for Uruk). Since *r* does not usually change into *l* in Sumerian,[23] the least that we must deduce is a Zagros origin of the speakers of those dialects in which the variant forms occurred. Perhaps we are justified in going even further. The Sumerian etymology of Ur as suggested by Poebel (*urim* from *urù-unu*(*g*), cf. the ideogram) is exceedingly far-fetched. On the other hand, the labial ending happens to be one of the usual terminations in the Zagros languages, as will be presently demonstrated: the interchange of the liquids points in the same direction. As for Uruk,[24] the name is usually derived from *unu*(*g*) "dwelling," since that is the ideographic writing for the well-known city. One may wonder, however, if this is not after all a case of popular etymology, at least for graphic purposes, such as we have in the case of Ninua, Urbilum (> *arba-ilu*), etc. The ideogram for Ur means "shrine of Nannar," for Larsa "shrine of Utug," for Hallab "shrine of Ninni"; in the case of Uruk we should just have "shrine," which seems rather colorless even if we make it to signify a shrine *par excellence*.[25] It would seem, therefore, that the case is still open for discussion.

---

[19] *Ib.*, 20.

[20] Cf. Hüsing, *OLZ* 1903: 399–402.

[21] *AASOR* VIII, 27, note 50. The *-nd-* element of these names is particularly worth noting since it recalls a common Anatolian suffix; cf. ch. VI.

[22] Cf. *CT* XVIII 28, *c* and *d* 15; see also Poebel, *SG* 64.

[23] *Ib.*, 66.

[24] Note in this case, too, the labial ending in the form *Illab*.

To return to the Lullu, the native designation for the people was *Lullu-bī, or Lullu-mē*, the forms occurring in a large variety of spellings.[26] The labial suffix (which is clearly marked as such by the fact that it may be omitted), is the above-mentioned plural ending which is also found in Elamite proper. With the suffix the name might be translated "the Lullu people," or the like. We scarcely need better proof of the relationship between the languages of the Lullu and of Elam. Whether the labial ending also had a collective or neuter significance is not certain, but probable. At all events, we meet it in names of mountains and districts definitely located in Lullu territory, such as the famous mountain of the Flood, *Niṣir*, "which the Lullu called *Kini-pa*,"[27] and further in the *Niš-pi* range (modern Awraman).[28] A near-by land was called *Sum-bi*.[29] Perhaps to the same category of names belong the two *Zab* rivers, wr. *Za-ba*, or with the further addition of the equally characteristic Zagros element *(a)n*, Za-ba-an (in several spellings), from which place-names were also derived. The Babylonian cities *Adab* and *Kullab* may perhaps be of similar provenance. This nominal termination should not be confused with the verbal termination *-ip*, which is especially common in Hurrian (see below). It is very remarkable that a non-Indo-European labial termination of the same kind is found as far west as Sicily. Kretschmer has indeed compared it with our Elamitic form. That the names may belong to the general Japhetic group is very probable, in view of the archaeological remains from the same district, which indicate Asiatic connections. But the precise correspondence with forms of the Zagros territory is probably nothing more than an interesting coincidence. Kretschmer cites the Sicilian ethnicon Κεντόριπες, from which the place-name *Kentur-ipa* is derived. He also calls attention to the remarkable fact that the name of the Sicilian Elymites is spelled in Greek in exactly the same way as that of the Asiatic Elamites (’Ελυμαῖοι). Moreover, near the district of the Elymites lay the port Λιλύβαιον or Λιλύβη, which reminds one of the Lullubi.[30] Striking as these parallels are, they are very inconclusive in view of the fact that the Elamites of the Zagros called themselves *Hallapi*, whose land was *Ha(lla)pirti*; *Elamu* and *Elamtu* were Semitic designations, and it is hardly conceivable that the Sicilian Elymites were influenced by the Akkadians in the choice of their own name. What value there may be in employing toponymic material for ethnic comparisons is mainly derived from the geographic proximity of the elements compared; where that is wanting, speculations often become gratuitous.

---

[25] On the other hand, it must be admitted that E-anna 'the temple of heaven' played a very important part in the religious life of Uruk. According to *OECT* II pl. I, col. 2. 46 f., E-anna was even the older name of Uruk. This would argue in favor of the traditional etymology; the above suggestion is, therefore, a very tentative one.

[26] Cf. the list of variants in *Orientalia* 36–38. 113 f., to which should be added the forms with an initial nasal, such as we have in the Kirkuk tablets; cf. *e.g.*, (*māt*)*Nu-ul-lu-a-i-ú*, *Harvard Semitic Series* (*HSS*) V 8.9.

[27] Ashurnasirpal, *Annals* 2. 34.

[28] Cf. *AASOR* VIII 28.

[29] Cf. Thureau-Dangin, *Sargon*, Introduction III.

In concluding the discussion of the Lullu,[31] it should be added that in the Kirkuk records the name is usually written Nullu, with a nasal instead of the initial liquid. That change is common to the Hurrians; it is found, among others,[32] in the writing *Haligalbat* for the more usual *Hanigalbat*,[33] though here we have the reverse of the change observed above. Lullu servants and slaves were highly valued in ancient Arrapha,[34] and it is very interesting that the modern representatives of that people, viz. the *Lur-s*,[35] are unto the present

---

[30] See *Glotta* XIV 319, n. 1.

[31] It is needless to add that the number of available examples could be multiplied almost at will. For other place-names from the same region cf. M. Streck, "Das Gebiet der heutigen Landschaften Armenien, Kurdistan, and

---

Westpersien nach Babylonisch-Assyrischen Keilinschriften," part III, *ZA* XV (1900) 257–382, and Thureau-Dangin, *o.c.*

[32] Cf. *AASOR* VI 78, and 85, note 47.

[33] That the name was Hanigalbat and not Hanirabbat (which Smith, *EḪA* 210 considers as a possibility) is proved by the writing *(māt)Ha-ni-kal-bat* in the Amarna Letters (Knudtzon, 255. 10), and by the form *(māt)Ha-ni-kal-bat*, *HSS* V. 63.3. For the ending *-at* and its relation to Lullu names cf. ch. V. In the meantime attention may be called to the principal river of the Lullu-country, *Turn-at*, the modern Diyala, whose Shehirzor branch is known as Tanjero; cf. also Streck, *l. c.*, 275 f.

[34] For Lullu slaves cf. Koschaker, *Neue keilschriftliche Rechtsurkunden aus der el-Amarna-Zeit* (Leipzig, 1928) 53, n. 1.

[35] It may be of interest to list here the various indications which we possess concerning the spread of Lullu elements. In our own day we have, then, the *Lur*-s in *Lur*-i-stān. For the *Lullu* or *Nullu* in Arrapha see Koschaker, *l. c.* Just as in Arrapha, *Lullu* occurs as a personal name in Syria, in the Hurrian district of Qatna; cf. Virolleaud, *Syria* VIII (1928) 95. of the ethnic designations we have apart from (a) the native *Lullu-bī* (and its numerous variant (the doubtful Sicilian *Lilubē* would have to be assigned to this class, if Kretschmer is right), two other interesting forms in (b) *Lulu-ina* and (c) *Lula-hhu*. The former occurs in Haldian texts, where it is equated with Akkad; cf. Tseretheli, *Die neuen ḫaldischen Inschriften König Sardurs von Urarṭu* 54; the suffix *-ina* is characteristic of that language, as will be pointed out in ch. VI. The other form has a typical Hurrian suffix (cf. ch. V for other examples). The relation of *Lula-hhu* to the Lullu is discussed in a brilliant article of Landsberger, entitled "Ḫabiru und Lulaḫḫu," *KF* I (1929) 321–334. The author takes the *Lulahhu* (for references cf. *ib.* 326) as an appellative designation, originally based on the ethnic name. The sense would be something like "mountaineer," "barbarian." It is very significant that the Nuzi tablets know of a certain *Habira*, son of *Nuli* (Cf. Chiera, *Inheritance Texts* (Paris, 1927) 6, 16,) and further that both the Habiru and the L/Nullu are frequently mentioned in

day the best porters (*ḥammāl-s*) in Baghdad. One must have seen them carry the enormous weights that they do in order to believe what they are actually capable of performing.

In the neighborhood of Barahsi lay the district of *Tukriš*.[36] The name belongs to the Gutian family, and it is to this group that we must now give our attention.

The Guti. For the study of the Guti we are favored with an appreciable amount of direct information, unlike the case of the Lullu where we were obliged to resort largely to the internal evidence of the onomastic material. This welcome effusiveness of the cuneiform sources is in the instance of the Guti directly traceable to the fact that these mountaineers gained for themselves the sovereignty of Sumer and Akkad,

---

the Kirkuk texts, the former certainly in an appellative sense. Landsberger would also interpret the difficult *Lullā-awīlu* of the Creation Epic (cf. *KB* VI p. 126. 6) as "wild man," or the like. This suggestion is very appealing, especially in view of the prominence of the Lullu slaves. Our "wild Indian" has now much the same meaning, without a trace of any ethnic connotation. It appears then that the name Lullu, and its derivatives, had a great vogue. It has been preserved to this day, thus parallelling in its career the name of a related people, the Guti. For still other, but rather doubtful possibilities with regard to the preservation of the name *Lullu* see Hüsing, *OLZ* 1918: 47.

[36] Tukrish is mentioned as a neighbor of Elam and Marhashi/Barahsi in *KAV* 92. 34. It occurs also in an inscription of Shamshi-Adad I, probably also in connection with Elam; cf. *AOB* I, p. 24, col. 4. 6–8, and see ch. II, n. 1. Cf. also the afore-mentioned text, *URI* 146. While on the subject of the neighbors of the Lullu we may indicate that *KAV* 92. 39 groups together the Lullu-bī and the Turukkī; for a discussion on the position of the latter see Albright, *JAOS* 45. 235, and *AOB* I, p. 61, n. 12. Since the final sibilant in *Tukriš* is merely a suffix, while the long ī of *Turukki* has a gentilic significance, it is not impossible that there was originally some relation between *Tukri* and *Tur(u)ki*; the transposition of the *r*-sound is not an unusual occurrence. Cf. *e.g.*, *Ur(u)-aṭri/Urarṭu*, *AOB* I, p. 113, n. 9. But this is, of course, not a necessary assumption, and in later times the two names are kept apart. For similar elements (without any suggestion of relationship) we may cite here the name *Urki-š*, whose king Arisen also ruled over *Namar* (cf. the following chapter) at the time of the Dynasty of Agade. It may be added that the name *Tukriš* is prominent, surprisingly enough, in the above-mentioned tablets from Qaṭna.

which they held for more than a century.[37] In doing so they precipitated the end of the brilliant Dynasty of Agade, although they did not attain to the complete mastery of the entire plain until an ephemeral dynasty of Uruk had failed in an attempt to introduce order into the demoralized land. But the ultimate subjugation of the empire that the great Sargon had built was foreshadowed as early as the time of Naram-Sin, who suffered defeat at the hands of the Gutians.[38] Shar-kalisharri struggled for some time with the affairs of a very weakened and, undoubtedly, curtailed Akkad, but his reign was followed by a period of such utter anarchy that it became known by the quaint and suggestive designation, "Who was king, and who was not king?"[39] Thus the stage was set for the rule of Gutium, "the stinging serpent of the mountains."[40] Even the rather exclusive king lists, which had snubbed the able rulers of Lagash, recognize the Dynasty of Gutium and give the names of its members.[41]

These names are of great interest for determining the ethnic affiliations of the Gutians. Among them we find three that contain an element variously transcribed as *Warla-*, *I̯arla-*, and *Arla-*. The initial consonant was obviously the same as in *Halman-Arman* (see above); the second element of these names is *-laga-* and the final consonant appears as *b*, *š*, or *n*. The complete names of the three kings as given by the Oxford prism[42] are respectively *I̯arlagab*, *I̯arla*, and *I̯arlagan-da* (with an additional syllable after the *n*); parallel versions furnish the variants *Warlagaba*, *I̯arlagaš*, and *Arlagan*. The ending *-n* is also found in the name of the last king of the Dynasty of Gutiam, *Tirigā-n*,[43] but it is omitted in that instance in the Oxford prism. Among the Gutian kings not listed in the dynastic accounts we find the names *Lasirab*, and *Šarlak*.[44]

---

[37] Cf. now *OECT* II, pl. IV, col. 6. 25–51, and notes *a.l.*

[38] See *AfO* V 140.

[39] Sumerian: *a-ba-àm lugal a-ba-àm nu lugal*; Akkadian: *ma-nu-um šarrum ma-nu-um la šarrum.* Cf. Poebel, *HT* 133; for references to the period of anarchy in the omen-texts see Weidner, *MF* 234. 5.

[40] For a convenient edition of the text of Utu-hegal, in which the defeat of the Gutian king Tiriqan is related, see Gadd, *A Sumerian Reading-Book* (Oxford, 1924) 64 ff. For a reference to that event in the omen-texts see Weidner, *l. c.*

[41] See above, note 37.

[42] *Ib.*

In reviewing the endings, no comment is needed on the *-ak* of the last-named ruler. The *-an* is just as distinctly a formative of the larger Zagros group, in which we have already placed Elamite and Lullu. As for *-š*, it has so far been noted in *Sima-š*, *Kima-š*, *Tukri-š*, and it is probably identical with the *si*/*še* in *Barahsi* and its variants.[45] In that case it would be closely connected with the termination *si*, which we have observed in Lullu. It may be added that, judging from the indications available at present, all of the above places were in close proximity to one another. We may recall here the name of the king of Hamazi, called *Hadaniš*; it is also worthy of notice that the ending *aš* is one of the most common in Kassite, both in personal and in place-names. Thus we have kings *Gandaš*, *Kaštiliaš*, etc., and the cities *Karduniaš* (Babylon), *Tupliaš* (for older Elamitic *Ešnunnak*), and many others. It is possible, of course, that in *si* and *-š* we have two different, though related, suffixes.

---

[43] For the several towns by that name see Albright, *JAOS* 45. 222 f. See also *JRAS* 1928, 868–875. Again we note the difficulty of differentiating between place and personal names.

[44] For Lasirab cf. Poebel, *HT* 135. Sharlak, king of *Ku-ti-im*(*ki*), who was defeated by Sharkalisharri of Agade, is certainly a ruler of the Guti and not of the city of Kuta; cf. Hommel, *Ethnologie* 1017.

[45] The *š* is probably only a simple *s*-sound, just as in Hurrian, and also in Hittite. For Kimash see Smith *EHA* 378, and Poebel, *ZA* XXXIX 129 ff. The prince of Kimash (at the time of the Third Dynasty of Ur) is Hunnini, whose name is Elamitic (*ib.* 139), or more specifically Lullu; cf. the names Annubanini and Tardunni (see above). A further example of the close relationship between the people of Barahsi, Lullu, and Gutium, is furnished by the name of the Gutian king *Igeša'u-š* (*OECT* II, *l.c.* 35), which shows the same final element as *Sidga'u* of Barahsi (ch. II, n. 66), except for the subject-suffix *š*.

In this connection one cannot avoid mentioning *Lagaš*. Both the ending and the stem are so characteristic of the Guti names, as we have just seen, that the word must be assigned to that group. This would mean, of course, that there were Gutian elements in Sumer from the earliest dynastic period. Surely, such a fact need not cause any surprise.[46] There is no reason why the pre-Sumerian population of the country should not have consisted of other mountain tribes apart from the Elamites to whom the former were related. The seizure of power following the collapse of the Dynasty of Agade was, then, due to a fresh invasion of Gutian tribes; similarly the Elamites reappear after the First Dynasty of Ur, and later under Warad-Sin and Rim-Sin. The prosperity of Lagash under Gudea, in a period that evidently coincides with the rule of the Guti, would thus have been due not altogether to accident. It may be added that Lagash had frequent contacts with the north: Arad-Nannar of Lagash, the contemporary of Shu-Sin, is also governor of Urbilum.[47]

The element *lag*(*a*) is found in another Gutian city, this time in the district of Sulaimania. The place in question is transcribed for us by the Assyrian writers as *Lagalaga*, *Tagalaga*, and even *Lagabgalaga*; it has been identified with modern Ulubulagh,[48] facing the peak of Omar Gudrun, which is doubtless the Mount Niṣir[49] or Kinipa, of the account of the Flood. It is true that the country has been assigned to the Lullu. But at the same time the Mount of the Flood is on one occasion placed in the country of the Guti. The two related mountain peoples lived, no doubt, side by side, often overlapping with one another; on the border line we may expect names belonging to both groups. In the present instance the element *lag*(*a*) points to the Gutian origin of the name.

---

[46] Cf. Poebel, *ZA* XXXIX 138.

[47] Cf. Barton, *RISA* 268. 16.

[48] Cf. *AASOR* VIII 17.

[49] Cf. For a list of references to Mount Niṣir cf. Streck, *ZA* XV 272–275.

The same name furnishes another bit of valuable information. From the variant spellings of the first syllable (*la-*, *ta-*,) it is clear that the initial sound had the same *tl* character[50] which was pointed out as one of the phonetic peculiarities of Elamite. It is one of the significant occurrences throughout the group of Zagros languages. In Lullu its presence may be gathered from the name of the city *Atlila*, one of the main sites of Zamua, which was rebuilt by Ashurnasirpal and renamed Dur-Ashur.[51] The simpler spelling is seen in the name *Atilu*, which is mentioned in a letter of Saushshatar of Mitanni addressed to the local king of Arrapha.[52]

As for the common Gutian suffix *-b*,[53] it appears to be a verbal formative rather than a nominal suffix. The material is too scanty to justify a more definite statement; perhaps we have here, after all, the same element as in the Elamite-Lullu nominal termination *-p* or *-b*, which was discussed in the passages dealing with the Lullu.

It follows from the preceding that the linguistic position of the Gutians is distinctly within the larger Zagros group, which includes also the Lullu and the Elamites. It is, therefore, strange to find in the scientific literature on the subject more or less definite suggestions that the Gutians should be regarded as Semites,[54] or even as Indo-Europeans.[55] The latter view has been gaining ground of late and it is now necessary to inquire into the reasons which have prompted this position. It will be seen that the whole structure is based on the flimsiest foundations; and on probing further into the matter, it will become apparent that the alleged basis for the assumption that the Guti contained Indo-European admixtures, if indeed they were not Indo-Europeans in the full sense of the term,[56] ceases to exist altogether when the material cited in support of the argument has been carefully examined. It should be added that the subject calls for the utmost caution in handling it; for Indo-Europeans, or more precisely Aryans (Indo-Iranians), do actually appear in Mesopotamia at about the middle of the second millennium,[57] while in the course of the first millennium most of the Zagros becomes Indo-Europeanized to a large extent. In the present case, however, we should have to postulate the arrival of that new ethnic group a whole millennium earlier than is generally assumed, which would constitute a very serious difference in any historical investigation. Moreover, the presence in Mesopotamia of a larger body of Aryans, as early as the third millennium, would affect very considerably the whole question of Indo-Iranian origins; it would amount to little less than a scientific revolution.

---

[50] For reference see note 48.

[51] *Ib.*, 28.

[52] Cf. *JAOS* 49. 270 (1. 8). This does not imply that *Atlila* and *Atilu* were one and the same city, but only the virtual identity of their names. On the other hand, a topographical identity is by no means out of the question. The letter of Saushshatar mentions also the city Paharrashe in connection with Atilu, and the former name may conceivably be related to P/Barahs(h)i. However, it cannot be said as yet that these combinations inspire much confidence.

[53] As in Warlaga-b, Lasira-b, *etc.* It is quite probable that the plural suffix *-b* with an overhanging vowel was also known to Gutian just as it was used in Elamite and in Lullu. In an inscription of Arad-Nannar of Lagash we find the expression *ma-da Gu-te-bu-um*(*ki*)*-ma* (cf. Barton, *RISA*, p. 260. 16, line 20); the district in question is certainly to be sought in the Zagros, as is definitely certain from the context. It is very likely, therefore, that *Gutebum* represents *Guti* with the plural element added, the same combination that we find in *Lu-lu-bu-um*(*ki*), II Rawlinson 50, obv, 4. 27.

If we look now for the reasons that have prompted some scholars, nevertheless, to advocate so momentous a theory, we shall find, much to our surprise, that in the case of the Guti the entire problem of their assumed Aryanization rests upon a single cuneiform passage. More startling still is the fact that the passage in question is singularly inadequate to base upon it any theory whatsoever, no matter how inconsequential and harmless. It happens to be nothing more serious than a contract for the purchase of slaves.

---

[54] Schorr, *Altbabylonische Rechtsurkunden* (Leipzig, 1913) p. 155.

[55] Cf. especially Christian, *MAGW* LVIII 223.

[56] *Ib.*

[57] On the appearance of the Aryans in Syria and Mesopotamia see J. Friedrich, *RLA* I 144–148.

The contract (*a*) reads as follows: "204 and 2/3 Qa of oil, according to the measure of Shamash, its value being 1/3 mina 2/3 shekel in silver, for the purchase of Gutian slaves, *namrūti*(*m*), from A, at the request of B, C has received. Within one month *namrūti* Gutian slaves he shall furnish. If they are not furnished within a month, 1/3 mina 2/3 shekel of silver B to the bearer of his receipt shall pay out."[58] A typical Old-Babylonian contract couched in the usual legal terminology of the period. The word *namrūti* has been left purposely untranslated for the time being. In order to arrive at its meaning it will be necessary to quote from two other contemporary documents (from the period of the First Dynasty of Babylon), where the word occurs in similar contexts, although the Guti are not mentioned in them.

b. "(Concerning) 1 and 1/3 minas of gold, belonging to A, as the purchase price of a Shubaru slave by the Euphrates caravan, which B to C has given. On the day of the arrival of his (C's) caravan one Shubaru slave, *namram*, he shall furnish and his contract he shall destroy."[59] Here the slave is specified as *namru* (the adjective is in the accusative). It will be noted that the original agreement does not mention the particular qualification of the slave which is implied by the word *namru*; but the acceptance of the purchased servant is contingent upon his being regarded as *namru*.

---

[58] The text originally published by Meissner, *Beiträge zum altbabylonischen Privatrecht* no. 4, is also included in Schorr, *o.c.* no. 105, and in Kohler-Ungnad, *Hammurabi's Gesetz* III no. 191.

[59] Peiser, *KB* IV p. 44 (no. III).

c. This text (a letter) is usually ignored in the discussions which are based on the meaning of the above-mentioned Akkadian adjective. The reason for this omission is, doubtless, to be seen in the fact that no people is mentioned here by name. However, the city of Arrapha, from which the letter was written, is well known as a Shubaru center, hence the subject matter is strictly relevant to our present purpose. Briefly,[60] the writer of the letter (*A*) reports to his associate in Babylonia (*B*) that his trip had been attended by numerous misfortunes. On his arrival at Arrapha, the servant boy had gathered the pack-animals and had disappeared with them. *A* himself had been taken ill and, worst of all, a slave-girl intended for *B* had died. Then, as though in an attempt to counterbalance the effect of such alarming news, *A* adds: "But there is here a *nawirtum* hand-maid."[61] Evidently *B* is expected to feel consoled for the loss of the previous servant-girl upon being informed that another one is obtainable, who is *nawirtum* (fem. of *namru*).

We may now proceed to the examination of the Akkadian adjective in question. The usual translation given in the above passages is "fair-skinned," or "fair-complexioned" (hell-farbig). In earlier publications a question-mark is found with the above rendering, but recently the doubts seem to have disappeared from the minds of the translators and the rendering is no longer indicated as uncertain.[62] The fair complexion has apparently satisfied everybody and the Guti have been associated with this physical trait not only in strictly philological works but also in general historical studies. Eduard Meyer mentions "hellfarbige Gutäer" in his *History*

---

[60] Cf. Ungnad, *Babylonische Briefe aus der Zeit der Ḫammurapi-Dynastie* (Leipzig, 1914), no. 162.

[61] *Ib.*, line 22.

[62] With a question mark the translation is given by Schorr, and Kohler-Ungnad.

of the Ancient World,[63] and the Gutians are henceforth described as fair-skinned, also in more popular works, whose authors are not in a position to control the sources. But even Assyriologists have not been slow to base important deductions on the passages listed above. Soon the Gutians as a whole are described as fair-skinned, although the one passage which deals with the *namrūti* members of that people mentions only "slaves from Gutium." For the sake of consistency the Shubaru should receive the same treatment, since *namru* is also used, as we have seen, of slaves recruited from among the latter. Hence a recent publication includes, logically enough, the two peoples in the same fair-complexioned category: "It appears, therefore, that fair complexion was typical of these countries, though racial admixture had already tended to debase the type."[64] This is not at all surprising, perhaps even justifiable, in view of the general agreement among the latest translators. But another scholar goes much farther. Accepting the usual rendering of the word *namru*, he adds: "Dieser Aussdruck lässt sich doch wohl kaum anders verstehen, als dass damals unter den Gutäern Individuen mit heller Komplexion (heller Hautfarbe, blondem Haar, blauen Augen) vorhanden waren. Helle Komplexion spricht aber entschieden für Zugehörigkeit zu einer der blonden europäischen Rassen, die bekanntlich stark unter Indogermanen vertreten sind."[65] This is certainly going to unwarrantable extremes. Assuming even that the available philological evidence has been interpreted correctly, it is hardly permissible to place an imposing structure of early Indo-European migrations upon the shoulders of a slave or two. Moreover, if the Gutians were really Indo-Europeans, the same must be equally true of the Hurrians (Shubaru). And to say that the very extensive group of Hurrians consisted largely of Indo-European elements as early as the third millennium would be carrying the subject to fantastic lengths.

---

[63] *GA* I.2 (4th ed.) 423. Meissner (*Babylonien und Assyrien* I 376) also accepts the rendering "helle Sklaven."

[64] Smith, *EHA* 72.

[65] See note 55.

It has been pointed out that these bold speculations are based on the meaning of the Akkadian word *namru*. We may now be pardoned for wondering whether the translation "fair-complexioned" is at all justified. Let us return for a moment to the texts that have been quoted above, in order to see whether the subject of complexion has anything to do with the case. In text *a* we have a strictly matter-of-fact business contract, which is worded with the customary brevity of such documents. The order is for slaves from Gutium, a mountain district evidently known for its sturdy workmen. The neighboring country of the Lullu was famous for its laborers in ancient times (cf. the Kirkuk tablets), just as it is today (the Baghdad *ḥammal-s* are all Lurs). Are we at all justified to read into the contract the strange specification that the slaves shall be fair-skinned? What really mattered was the physical condition of the slave. Would the color of the skin affect the ability of the workmen in the slightest? Von Luschan tells us that it would. He has pointed out that the mountain districts of the Near East were not favorable to the preservation of blond races; within a few generations the blonds would all die out and the dark-complexioned individuals would be the only ones to become acclimated.[66] In other words, fair-complexioned slaves would have been in ancient Mesopotamia a serious liability, and no level-headed Babylonian could be expected to insist on obtaining such servants.

The second text (b) confirms our present doubts on the subject of complexion. The commission is this time for a Shubaru slave, and nothing is said at first about his qualifications.

---

[66] Von Luschan, *Voelker, Rassen, Sprachen* 92. The entire process is termed by the author "klar wie in einem Schulbeispiel."

When the servant is furnished, the document adds, he will be accepted on condition that he is found *namru*. How blondness would fit in here, I cannot tell.

Finally, the letter (c) consoles the addressee that a *nawirtu* slave-girl chosen for him by the writer will help make up for the loss by death of another hand-maid. Unless we read present-day ideas into the mind of the Babylonian master, we cannot explain why he should have felt specially pleased with the purchase of a blonde lass. The tone of the letter implies clearly that, although one slave-girl had died, another able servant had been secured in her stead. The quaint preference for blondes probably did not exist at all in ancient Babylonia; rather it seems to have taken hold of a not inconsiderable circle of modern scholars.

I do not wish to appear flippant, but I am desirous to indicate that this type of interpretation has been carried too far, especially when it is liable to be used as a basis for historical deductions of serious consequence. In the above instances not only does the context fail to support the accepted translation of *namru*, but a moment's thought about Akkadian idiomatic usage would have resulted in the rejection of the rendering that has now gained such vogue. When the Akkadians speak of dark-complexioned people they describe them as *ṣalmat qaqqādi*, that is to say "black-headed." So distinctive a trait as blondness would surely be signified by some such phrase as "fair of skin," "light of hair," or the like. Fair complexion was certainly not an every-day occurrence in Babylonia, to be expressed by a simple adjective; particularly so in the very precise terminology of the legal documents.

How is *namru*, then, to be translated? The answer may be found quite easily by consulting further contract literature. We will choose a parallel context and look for a synonymous adjective. A very good analogon is found in a recently published volume of Kirkuk tests.[67] In one of the documents[68] we have a deposition of one A, who owed B a slave-girl. Before witnesses A delivers a Kassite (i.e. Babylonian)[69] girl to B, and the debt is consequently cancelled. Should either party break the agreement, the penalty shall be two slave-girls described as *damqu*.[70] The meaning is here perfectly clear; the word signifies "sound," healthy," "good," and it is precisely what one expects in contracts of this type. What is essential about slaves is, of course, their ability to do the work that is expected of them. A weakly servant is an entirely useless bit of property, and health and strength are the main things that a prospective owner is stipulating in these cases. It is obvious that *namru* must have the same meaning.

---

[67] *HSS* V. [68] *Ib.* no. 37.

To make assurance doubly sure, there is also an imposing array of direct evidence to show that *damqu* and *namru* are actually synonymous.[71] The original meaning of both adjectives is 'shining,' 'bright.' The ideogram with which *damqu* is written (SIG$_5$) means primarily 'to shine' (*barāru*) and then, in a derivative sense, 'to be favorable, bright, good,' etc. Since *damqu* is used with such nouns as silver, garment, grain, sheep, and so forth,[72] no one has insisted on always giving the word its literal significance. It is also well attested that other Akkadian words for 'shining' such as *ellu*, *ebbu*, are frequently used in the more general meaning of 'pure,' 'excellent,' and the like.[73] In order not to carry this lexical discussion too far, I shall only add that *namru* itself occurs in the very instructive expression *būnu namru*, which does not mean, of course, 'a blond child,' or anything of the kind, but simply 'a bright child,' as has been well known for a long time.[74] Modern languages provide numerous examples for the same type of semantic development; I will mention only English 'splendid,' 'bright,' 'fair,' and German 'glänzend,' in their less literal meanings.

---

[69] Her name is given as Ulamashshi (1. 4). Here we have virtually the reverse of the above text *c*, where a Babylonian acquires a girl from Arrapha.

[70] *Ib.* ls. 15–16. Cf. also *ib.* 26: 18.

[71] As pointed out already by Delitzsch, *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch* (Leipzig, 1896) 221, under *damāḳu*.

[72] For examples cf. the list in Ungnad, *o.c.* p. 289 f. In the Kirkuk tablets the use of *damqu* is very exstensive. Cf. *e.g.*, Gadd, *Kirkuk* 3. 27–29: *1 immertu ša 2-šu bá-ak-nu dám-qu* (so instead of Gadd's *pa-ak-nu-ut-tuš*), *1 en-zu ša 2-šu qa-az-zu dam-qu.*

[73] Cf. especially H. Ehelolf, "Ein Wortfolgeprinzip im Assyrisch-Babylonischen," *Leipziger Semitistische Studien VI 3* (1916), pp. 1 ff., and 44 ff. The synonyms of *damqu* are *ellu, ebbu, namru, banū, and quddušu.* The principal

But we must not be sidetracked from our main problem. I think that it has been demonstrated beyond any shadow of doubt that the Babylonians of the time of Hammurabi did not have the slightest intention of drawing the color line with regard to their slaves. In establishing this point it was necessary to go into somewhat elaborate details. The myth of Gutian blondness has gained uncontrollable currency, and it is impossible to uproot so widespread a conviction without an exhaustive treatment of the subject. We may now return to the less disquieting question of the historical connections of the Guti with Mesopotamia.[75]

---

meaning is in all instances 'shining,' then 'clean,' 'pure,' especially in a religious sense. But the derivative connotation 'excellent,' 'splendid,' is also well represented. Thus we have *kištu ellītu* and *kištu ebbītu* 'a splendid forest.' Again, we have *ellu* as an adjective used with *šubtu* 'dwelling,' *daltu* 'door,' *rubū* 'prince,' *zēru* 'seed,' (Delitszsch, *HWB* 72 a); *banū* has the secondary significance 'gracious,' 'favorable,' (*ib.* 180 b.); as a fem. pl. noun *namarātu* has the value of 'joy,' 'gladness,' etc., (*ib.*, 468 b.). But it is hardly necessary to multiply examples any further.

[74] Cf. *Barton, Babylonian Writing* II, no. 411. The same ideogram that is used for *damqu* (SIG$_5$) is also found in the sense of *ubbubu* and *nummuru* (*ib.*) showing clearly to what extent those words were synonymous. These occurrences should have been ample warning to the translators who dealt with the passages cited above.

[75] I cannot see any reason for assuming with Frankfort (*Studies* II 121 f.) that the same movement "brought the Gutium down on Sumer and Akkad," which later "found a second center in North Syria, whence it radiated, thrusting the Amorites into Mesopotamia, . . . " The arrival of the Amorites in Mesopotamia (cf. the next chapter) was surely independent of the purely local

After the overthrow of the Dynasty of Gutium by Utu-hegal of Uruk, these hillmen seem to have left the south in peace; unless indeed they coöperated with the the Kassites in the overthrow of Babylon and in the subsequent rule by the invaders over the lands of Sumer and Akkad. But in the north the presence of the Gutians was always keenly felt. Until the rise of the Assyrian state there is, of course, no occasion for references in the cuneiform literature to the position which the mountain tribes occupied in their own territory. Nor was the small city-state of Ashur in a position to entertain serious political aspirations concerning the mountain districts of the north-east for almost three quarters of the second millennium. In reality, it was Assyria that remained under the domination of her neighbors, particularly of Mitanni, until after the middle of the millennium. Even the very beginnings of Assyrian home-rule are due to non-Semites. The father of the first governor of Ashur, who may be placed in the 23rd century B.C., bears the interesting name *I̯akulaba*,[76] which is very suggestive of the names of the Gutian rulers previously discussed. Among the earliest known *patesis* or *ishaks* of Ashur we find *Ušpia* and *Kikia*; they were in all likelihood Hurrians, thus anticipating by several centuries the rule of the Mitanni at Ashur.[77] An Assyrian king of the 19th century bears the

---

incident of the Gutian invasion. The non-Semitic group that may have precipitated the invasion of Akkad by the Amorites can hardly be sought among the Gutians. For in the west it was the Hurrians with whom the Amorites had intimate intercourse; a better knowledge of their interrelations is likely to shed much light on some of the most obscure problems in the early history of the Western Semites.

[76] *Iakulaba* is the father of *Ititi*, the *aklum*, cf. *Keilschrift-texte aus Assur historischen Inhalts* (*KAH*) II, no. 1. 1–3. The meaning of *aklum* (=PA, cf. Lewy, *ZA* XXXVI 24) is probably judge; see Meissner, in *AOB* I, p. 2. n. 2.

[77] Smith, *EHA* 112, has expressed some doubts as to the "Mitannian" origin of the above rulers. He calls attention to the fact that the name *Kik*(*k*)*ia* is found not only in the Kirkuk tablets, but also in the Cappadocian inscriptions (cf. *ib.* 376–7.) cf. also Contenau, *Les tablettes de Kerkouk* (Paris, 1926) 4. How-

name *Adasi*, which shows elements that are characteristic of the Zagros regions hitherto examined, as was shown above. And lastly, not much later, we find at the head of Assyria one *Lullai̭*, whose name evidently means "the Lullubian." An earlier king, Shamshi-Adad I, had stated in his inscription that he had received tribute from the kings of Tukrish, and the king of the upper country, which is probably Elam.[78] There is, therefore, evidence of contacts with the mountain tribes, but Assyria is not yet strong enough to threaten the latter seriously, being more often at their mercy than in charge of the situation. As an independent political entity, with a distinctly Semitic character, Ashur does not emerge into the light of history until late in the second millennium. The time had arrived to turn the tables on the former oppressors, and Assyrian kings had acquired enough power to invade the territories of the mountaineers, among whom the Gutians were so prominent. The accounts of those expeditions shed an appreciable amount of light upon the character and the geographic distribution of the peoples in question.

Adad-nirari I (1310–1281) reports victories over "the armies of the Kashshū, the Qutī, the Lulumē, and of the Shubarū."[79] The population of the Zagros is here gathered into three outstanding groups (the "Quti" are, of course, the Guti of the southern records). The Kashshu (Kassites) comprise not only

---

ever, while there is no absolute certainty on the matter, the probability is very great that Ushpia and Kikia were Hurrians after all. The element *kik-* occurs in the name of the well-known *Kikkuli* of Mitanni, and the formation of the names in question is perfectly in accordance with what is otherwise known concerning the construction of Hurrian personal names. Since the Hurrians are well represented in the Boghazkoi records, it need not surprise us to find in Cappadocia a name that is probably Hurrian. There are also other onomastic elements in the Cappadocian inscriptions that have their parallels among the material from the region east of the Tigris. Cf. ch. VI.

[78] See above, n. 36.

[79] *KAH* I 5. 3–5; cf. *AOB* I, p. 57 f.

the foreign invaders from the Zagros, but also the Babylonians in general.[80] Thus we are faced towards the end of the second millennium with the same main ethnic groups that confronted us in Babylonia many centuries earlier. The Guti impress us as practicularly important, since the king goes on to specify that his father Arikdēnilu, had been ruler over "the mountains and the hill-country of the wide-spreading Qutī."[81] Shalmaneser I (1280–1261) follows these victories with further successes against Armenia (*Uruaṭri*)[82] and Hanigalbat. But the Guti are not to be ignored: "Thereupon the Qutī, who like the stars of heaven know no number, (but) are expert in destruction, seceded, rebelled against me, and instituted hostilities."[83] This gives us a remarkably vivid picture of the Gutians, as regards both their numbers and their rapacious inclinations; one is immediately reminded of the unruly tribes of modern Kurdistan. The enemy is eventually subdued and treated with the cruelty that was to become proverbial of Assyrian monarchs. Over the wide area extending "from the boundaries of the land Uruaṭri up to the land Kummuhi" the blood of the Gutian troops is spilled "like water."[84] Thus the account locates the territories of the rebels between the range of Ṭur ʿAbdīn and Armenia, north-west and north of Assyria. On the other hand, we are informed by the next king, Tukulti-Enruta I (ca. 1250) that the Quti were to be found also across the Lower Zab, in the north-eastern corner of modern Iraq;[85] their position in the west as given by the previous kings (in the vicinity of Kummuhi) is also confirmed.[86] In other words, the whole of Central Zagros is shown to have included Gutian districts.

---

[80] Cf. Weidner, *AOB* I, p. 57, n. 7.

[81] *KAH* I, *l. c.* 21.

[82] On *Uruaṭri* cf. Weidner, *o.c.* 113, n. 9.

[83] *Ib.*, p. 119. 8–12.

[84] *Ib.*, p. 120. 21–23. For the reading Kummuhi, in preference to Kutmuhi, cf. Smith, *EHA* 390.

[85] Cf. *KAH* I, no. 16. 19–23. The country of the Guti extends as far as Mount Lalar, which we have noted already in the country of the Lullu; see above, n. 14.

In this connection it becomes necessary to consider the problem of the Qurṭi. Beginning with Tukulti-Enurta I, the name Qurṭi appears often in conjunction with that of the Quti.[87] The two groups are often listed in connection with and as the neighbors of the same tribes (Uqumani, Kummuhi), and it is practically impossible to distinguish between them. To be sure, both the Quti and the Qurṭi are occasionally mentioned in the same passage, but in those cases the Qurṭi appear to be a subdivison of their near namesakes, rather than a totally distinct group.[88] It is significant that Tiglath-Pileser I (1115–1093), who also had dealings with the Qurṭi, has nothing to say about the Quti.[89]

It will not be thought unnatural, in view of the facts mentioned in the preceding paragraph, that modern scholars should be divided on the question as to whether two peoples with so closely corresponding names are really identical or not. I believe that the solution of the difficulty may be gathered from two parallel passages, which form part of the inscriptions of Tukulti-Enurta I; both are found in a fairly recently published volume of *Historical Texts from Ashur*. The events in question took place at the beginning of the king's reign. Text *a* reads:

"On my accession to the royal throne, in my first year of reign, 28,800 warriors of the Hittites from the other side of the Euphrates I carried off, and in the midst of the I̱aurā mountains the Qurṭi, the Uqumani, as far as Sharnida (and) Mehri, my hand conquered."[90]

---

[86] *KAH* I, no. 17. 7–8.

[87] Cf. *KAH* I, no. 17. 4, and *KAH* II, 58. 23; 60. 31; 61. 27.

[88] Cf. *e.g.*, *KAH* I, no. 17. 4–7.

[89] Cf. *Prism* col. 2. 16–17; 3. 40–41; 4. 12–13.

[90] *KAH* II 60. 27–32.

Text *b*: "On my accession to the royal throne, 28,800 warriors of the Hittites from the other side of the Euphrates I carried off, and in the mist of the I̯aurā mountains the Qutī, Uqumani, (the people of) Elhunia and Sharnida, the land Mehri, my hand conquered."[91]

The two accounts are practically identical, except that instead of the Qurṭi of text *a*, we have the Quti in text *b*. This makes it reasonably certain that the two names were practically synonymous in meaning. One might add that "widespreading troups" are attributed to the Qurṭi just as they have been mentioned in connection with the Quti. But the philological connection between the two designations is obscure, in spite of the great similarity in sound. As a matter of fact, the reading *Qur-ṭi* is not as yet beyond all doubt; *Kur-hi* is equally possible, especially since the ending *hi* is well represented in the Zagros region,[92] and it can be also traced to the Hurrians of northern Mesopotamia and eastern Anatolia. However, the former transcription is now generally accepted, and it is indeed the more adequate one of the two, as will be presently explained. Assuming, then, that Qurṭi and Quti were two rival terms applied to the same ethnic group, the following opinions are possible with regard to the philological connection of these words: They are cognate linguistically; the slight phonetic disparity is due to the fact that among a certain section of the people, the pronunciation *Qurṭi* developed out of *Quti*, under influences that cannot be nearer determined, spreading ultimately to a large number of the Gutian tribes. Or else, Qurṭi was a totally different word, first used only by a definite group of the larger Gutian family, but gradually gaining in popularity. It is needless to add that the latter explanation would also hold good for *Kur-hi*. In either case, the fact remains indisputable that the Qurṭi, or Kurhi, were an important subdivision of the Gutians.

---

[91] *Ib.*, 23–28.

[92] Cf. e.g., the very prominent (*māt*)*Kir-hi*, references in *Orientalia* 36–38, p. 102. On the other hand, a king of Larbusa (in Zamua) at the time of Ashurnaspiral (*Annals* II 40, 59) bears the name *Ki-ir-ti-ia-ra*, which evidently means 'the man of Kirti,' (cf. ch. V for the ending (*a*)*ri*). In this case the reading *ti* is certain; incidentally, the Qurṭi were present in the Zamuan area, to judge from the text cited in n. 90.

An interesting sidelight upon the problem is furnished by several personal names, which are mentioned by Tiglath-Pileser I in connection with his war against the combined forces of the Kummuhi and the Qurṭi (the latter must represent, therefore, the western group of that people). "Kili-Teshup, the son of Kali-Teshup,"—says the Assyrian ruler in his report—"whom they call Irrupi, my hand captured in the midst of the battle."[93] The first two Qurṭian names contain the theophoric element "Teshup," which is at home in eastern Anatolia, Armenia, and all the Hurrian territories; the elements *Kili* and *Kali* bear a distinctly Hurrian character. The third name, *Irrupi*, shows the interesting suffix *-pi*, which we have found among the Gutians and their eastern neighbors. The above passage indicates also that Kili-Teshup was the formal, and Irrupi the original name, of the king in question.[94] This would fit in admirably with the rest of the picture. For official purposes Qurṭian chieftains borrowed their names from their presumably more civilized neighbors, such as the Hurrians and Haldians (= Urarṭians or proto-Armenians). But the genuine names of the Qurṭi point to a more easterly section of the Zagros where we have previously located the Guti.

The confidence with which most scholars have adopted the reading *Qur-ṭi* from the start is due to the occurrence in the same area of another name, which is practically identical in sound, and, in this case, well attested in writing. *Qurṭi* and Κύρτιοι correspond so closely that their equation is bound to

[93] *Prism* col. 2. 25–27.

[94] Cf. Smith, *EHA* 298.

satisfy even the most pedantic philologian. The comparison of the two names carries with it far-reaching implications. For it has been shown in an admirable recent study on "The name Kurd in its philological connexions"[95] that Κύρτιοι was one of the numerous designations for the basis population of Kurdistan. This is how Driver sums up his conclusions: ". . . the diverse forms—Qarda (or Karda), Kardūchi, Gortochi (and Gordi), Kardakes and Cyrtii, Gordyaei and Cordueni, Qardū and Qardā, Qardawāyê, Qurdāyê, Kartawāyê and Kurdayyâ, *etc.*—in spite of the differences have a common descent." The above names have been ferreted out from cuneiform, classical, and late Syriac sources; the author believes to have thus established a continuous chain that would link the modern Kurds with the Καρδοῦχοι of Xenophon, and possibly even with a tribe mentioned in a Sumerian document dating from the time of the Third Dynasty of Ur.[96] And it must indeed be admitted that all of the names listed by Driver contain the same element *k r d* (in several phonetic variants), while the endings are traceable to the various languages through which the name has been handed down. The strange part of Driver's work is that, after having established the connection between all the diverse groups just cited, he discovers philological scruples that prevent him from finally associating the older designations with the modern word for Kurd (Arabic *kurd*, pl. *akrād*). Ethnically, he admits, they are the same family. The philological difficulty is due, according to Driver, to the fact that the older names all show overhanging vowels, which are lacking in the current Arabic and Persian names by which the Kurds are known. I cannot help feeling that this

[95] Driver, in *JRAS* 1923: 393–403.

[96] The inscription in question is that of Arad-Nannar of Lagash, cf. Barton, *RISA*, p. 268, n. 16. The land under discussion is, however, not definitely established as *Karda*; the reading *Kardaka* is also possible, in view of the fact that this text is not consistent in supplying the Sumerian genitive suffix in proper names.

argument is more hair-splitting than is strictly necessary. Proper names are apt to be modified when used by other peoples; they are also liable to contamination through false analogies, popular etymologizing, and the like. When Driver suggests that the modern name should be combined with Persian *gurd* or *kurd*, probably "derived from a common origin with Babylonian *gardu* or *qardu*," and that the original meaning of the word was 'valiant' or 'brave,'[97] I feel that he has produced a fantastic explanation in place of one that is immediately appealing. That the name for the "widespreading" and whole-heartedly despised Kurds should in Persian signify "brave," a word that is alleged to go back (through what channels?) to an Akkadian prototype, is scarcely convincing reasoning. The connection of the Qurṭi with the Guti is also rejected by Driver, but the important passages in the annals of Tukulti-Enurta I were not available when the article was written.

It follows from the preceding that the connection between the modern Kurds and the ancient Κύρτιοι is certain, even though the philological relationship of these names may still be considered as doubtful. The confidence in the reading *Qurṭi* will now be easily understood. The geographical indications regarding the Cardūchi, Cordueni, and their philological congeners, tally so well with the cuneiform material concerning the Qurṭi, that a prominent historian has recently had no hesitancy in accepting the identification.[98] Furthermore, since we can no longer separate the Qurṭi from the Gutians, the survival of the latter in the population of modern Kurdistan cannot very well be doubted. However, this statement requires further comment.

---

[97] *L. c.*, 403.

[98] F. Bilabel, *Geschichte Vorderasiens und Ägyptens* (Heidelberg, 1927) I 184. Many inaccuracies have crept in into this work. The map appended to the book is particularly misleading. Arzuhina and not Arrapha is identified by B. with modern Kirkuk, which is plotted for some strange reason far to the north of Kermanshah, or about 500 miles out of its proper place.

The tribes included in the common designation of "Kurds" are no more uniform than the present-day "Caucasians." They differ markedly from one another in language as well as in physical characteristics. A Kurd from Sulaimania does not follow easily the speech of a fellow-Kurd from Bohtan.[99] From an anthropological point of view, there are among the Kurds of today tribes with "Armenoid," "Semitic," and "Aryan" characteristics. To speak of a common origin of the Kurdish people is manifestly incorrect.[100] The most probable view would be that the original population of Kurdistan, which may have consisted from the beginning of markedly different subdivisions was in historical times compelled to share their hill-country with stray groups of Assyrians and Arameans, while the subsequent Aryanization of the whole area also brought with it an infusion of alien Iranian elements. These facts must be borne in mind whenever we compare the results based upon philological material with the evidence of conditions which obtain in the land at present. If the modern descendants of the Guti or Qurti are to be found at all in Kurdistan, they must be sought among the tribes that have best preserved the physical traits of the old Zagros peoples.

Now the great majority of the Kurds of northern Iraq appear to a casual observer to be abnormally short-headed. This is well expressed in the oft-heard statement of the Birtish officials in Mesopotamia when they say that "the Kurd has no back to his head." It is quite possible that in northern Syria, or in western Persia, the Kurds will be found quite different in appearance. No one will deny, however, the presence among that group of hypo-brachycephalic elements, which may be safely attributed to the original Zagros population. We have seen how "widespread" the Gutians were towards the end of the second millennium. Their reputation for lawlessness and destructiveness was as well established then, as is the notoriety of the modern Kurds for the same traits. Where the cuneiform sources leave off, classical and later Semitic references take up the thread. The Cardūchi differ little from the Qurṭi, save in name, and that slight difference is more instructive than absolute correspondence could be. For the suffix of the former is capable of supplying valuable information, as we shall see.

---

[99] Cf. Speiser, *AASOR* VIII 1.

[100] *See Enzyklopaedie des Islām* II 1212–1237.

When Pliny speaks of "the people formerly called Cardūchi, but now Cordueni,"[101] adding that they bordered on the Adiabeni, he locates for us the tribes in question in the neighborhood of the Zab rivers, while indicating that the older gentilic termination was -*ḫi*. Strabo's reference to "the lands of the Gordyaei, whom the men of old called the Kardūchi" corroborates the above information.[102] It becomes clear that Xenophon's famous Καρδοῦχοι takes us back to a time when the suffix under discussion was still in use, which is, incidentally, strong presumptive ground that the language to which the suffix belonged had not yet been supplanted by the Iranian dialects spoken in later Kurdistan. What was, then, the older language? To associate the suffix -*ḫi* or χοι with the Armenian -*ḫ*, as is generally done, is not going to the direct source. For that termination is at least as old as the middle of the second millennium. It is amply attested in the Hurrian dialects. Thus we find in the Hurrian records from Boghazkoi the expression *Hattu-ḫe ewirne* ‘,the Hittite princes."[103] The Amarna Letters mention repeatedly the *Hurrū-ḫe* or *Hurwū-ḫe*, that is to say "the Hurrians."[104] The suffix is even found in

[101] Cf. Driver, *l. c.*, 395.

[102] *Ib.*

[103] Cf. Forrer, *ZDMG* 1922: 227.

[104] Cf. Knudtzon, *Index*, p. 1575.

the district of Arrapha (Kirkuk), for the Kassites are called in the Kirkuk tablets *Kuššu-ḫai̯*.[105] This makes it perfectly evident where the Cordueni had gotten their older gentilic form. We have seen that the Qurṭi used Hurrian names as early as Tiglath Pileser I. The later form *Cordu-eni* was apparently transmitted through Haldian (proto-Armenian) sources. In Haldian inscriptions we find *Babilū-nē* by the side of *Babilū*;[106] Akkad is translated as *Iului-na*,[107] which may conceivably hark back to the old Lullu, who dwelt north of Akkad. In Gordi and in Κύρτιοι the Zagros suffixes have completely disappeared.

Thus we have obtained independent evidence that the original Kurds were one of the ethnic groups that belonged to the large Zagros family. At the same time we have found an important link for connecting the "Kurds" with the Qurti or Gutians, just as the modern inhabitants of Luristan have been linked with the ancient Lullu. That the pre-Iranian inhabitants of the entire area did not disappear without leaving a trace was never contested. It is also generally admitted that the Haldians became an important element in later Armenia, and this view is borne out by philological evidence. New dialects and new creeds may have been brought with the invasions to which the mountainous districts of Hither Asia were so often subjected. But the old population has clung tenaciously to their native hills, and the evidences of racial characteristics, coupled with scattered linguistic survivals, provide valuable means for at least a partial reconstruction of past conditions, which may have obtained there from earliest known times.

---

[105] *HSS* V 37.6.

[106] Tseretheli, *Die ḫaldischen Inschriften*, p. 2.4.

[107] *Ib.*, p. 16, 17, and p. 54, note.

CHAPTER V

THE KASSITES AND THE HURRIANS

IT REMAINS for us to consider two peoples who between them dominated the Mesopotamian stage throughout most of the second millennium. The protagonist in Babylonia, as the old lands of Sumer and Akkad had come to be known, is the people known as Kashshu, or Kassites. The leading power in the north, which includes the young country of Assyria, were the Hurrians, the story of whose enormous expanse, from Armenia down to southern Palestine, and from the shores of the Mediterranean up to the borders of Persia, constitutes one of the most amazing chapters in the ancient history of the Near East. The cultivated Sumerians had disappeared as an independent ethnic unit, and the Semites of the North and of the South are in a state of complete political obscurity, due to the ascendancy of the two alien, we may say Japhetic, powers. In the meantime, a large ethnic family, the Indo-Europeans, heralds its readiness to become a prime factor in the subsequent history of the world, by making its influence felt among both the Kassites and the Hurrians; another branch of the same family actually attains to a dominant position in the distant lands of Anatolia, which the great Sargon had first brought to the attention of the ancient civilized world. Many hitherto obscure corners appear now in full light for the first time, so that the history of the second millennium is in a more literal sense the contemporary history of the world, than it could possibly have been hitherto.

Yet, strange to relate, a large part of this period, in which the universal stage is so largely extended, belongs to the least understood ones in the history of Mesopotamia. The reason for it, I venture to suggest, is not to be sought so much in the scarcity of written records, as in our failure to readjust the historical focus, so to speak. For we do really possess an imposing number of records relating to the era under discussion. Until recently, however, we were attempting to evaluate them from the point of view of Sumer or of Babylon, and to compare the achievements of the new age with those of the Sargonide or the First Babylonian dynasties. In reality, the center of gravity lies in this period in non-Semitic political units, and it is necessary to view the events from new and differently oriented quarters. Mesopotamia must be considered for the time being in terms of Hurrians and Kassites. To these latter we shall now turn for a brief survey of their ethnic position.

It is well known that the Kassites were a people of mountaineers, who first contributed to the downfall of the Dynasty of Hammurabi, and eventually took over the rule themselves, to maintain it for 576 years (1746–1171).[1] No other historical dynasty remained in power in Babylonia for nearly the same length of time. Ultimately the Kassites disappear as such from Lower Mesopotamia, but in the hill-country to the northeast they are still found in classical times under a name that is transcribed as Κοσσαῖοι.[2] This latter spelling is interesting in view of the Arraphan rendering *Kuššu-hai.*[3] It would appear that the pronunciation *Kaššū*, hence with an *a*-vowel instead of *u/o*, was due to Akkadian influence. The Biblical *Kūš*, where it seems to refer to Babylonia rather than to Ethiopia, might thus represent the original vowel, though the Amarna Letters retain the Babylonian and Assyrian forms with *a*.

Concerning the Kassite language we are very meagerly informed, since no connected texts in Kassite have been preserved, assuming that such texts were ever composed. The Babylonian syllabaries contain translations of a handful of Kassite words, and renderings of certain elements found in personal and in divine names.[4] It has been doubted, however, whether the scribes in question had a reliable knowledge of the Kassite language.[5] At all events, from the little material that we now have available for the study of the Kassite language (first collected by Delitzsch and lately re-edited by Pinches),[6] it is quite clear that the connections of that language are with the Zagros groups. Several divine names show, it is true, Indo-Iranian elements, just as the latter are also found in Hurrian; but the bulk of the preserved Kassite words, as well as the majority of the personal names, allow of no mistake as to the original affiliations of the people. The Aryan elements are due to the appearance in Mesopotamia, towards the middle of the second millennium, of an apparently small group of Indo-European warriors.[7]

---

[1] See R. C. Thompson, *CAH* I, ch. XV.

[2] Cf. Delitzsch, *Die Sprache der Kossäer* (Leipzig, 1884) 1 f.

[3] Cf. *HSS* V 37. 6.

Hüsing considers Kassite simply a northern dialect of Elamite.[8] Indeed, some of the words from the two languages show only dialectal differences, so when Kassite *miri-i̯aš* 'earth' is compared with the Elamite cognate *muru*. In Kassite, too, we have divine names ending in *-ak*, such as *Šip-ak* (Marduk), cf. Elam. *Tišp-ak* (Enurta). On the other hand, we have the very common substantive ending -(*i̯*)*aš*, which corresponds more closely with the Hurrian suffix than with the east-Zagros termination *si/še*. There are also very interesting parallels between Kassite and proto-Hittite (Hattic); thus Kassite *b/mašhu*[9] 'god' is clearly related to Hattic *wašha-b*,[10] which has the same meaning; similarly, Hattic *wuiū* 'land'[11] is obviously cognate with Elamite *muru*, and Kassite *miri-i̯aš*.[12] The Hattic interchanges of liquids and nasals also parallel the phonetic peculiarities of the eastern group,[13] and the variant writings of the name *Tabarna* or *Labarna* indicate for Hattic the formerly observed *tl*-sound. Moreover, it was the attack of the "Hattu" upon Babylon[14] that foreshadowed the overthrow of the First Dynasty and the resultant domination of the Kassites. What these similarities, found over so wide an area, appear to suggest is simply some ultimate relationship of the peoples involved. But to set up at present, on the basis of our very scanty material, nice dialectal distinctions, would be entirely premature.

---

[4] Cf. Delitsch, *o. c.*; Th. Pinches "The Language of the Kassites," *JRAS* 1917, pp. 101–114 (texts on pp. 103 and 105).

[5] So Hüsing, *Memnon* IV 24, and *OLZ* 1917: 207.

[6] Cf. n. 4.

[7] See especially the article of J. Friedrich, "Arier in Syrien und Mesopotamien," *RLA* I 144–148, and the literature cited there.

[8] *Memnon* IV 22 ff., and a series of notes on the subject of "Kaspisches," *OLZ* 1917: 106–108; 178–181; 205–209; *OLZ* 1918: 43–48; 264–272. As usual, Hüsing's remarks are stimulating, but his conclusions are not always convincing. The ethnic relations which he deduces from a few doubtful correspondences (*OLZ* 1918: 271) are exceedingly far-fetched.

Nor does it seem advisable for the time being to follow Hüsing and his school in changing the name of the Kassites into *Kas-pi*, on the analogy of *Lullu-bi*, and the like.[15] It is perfectly possible, though by no means certain, that *Kas-pi* was the native gentilic form. So far, however, the assumption rests on inference only. When Hüsing adduces the name of the Caspian Sea, and of the ancient city of Kasbin (modern Kazwīn), as proof of the original expansion of the Kassites,[16] he merely heightens the probability of his hypothesis; the final proof is still wanting. Others have gone further and discovered a Kassite element in the name of the Caucasus (Kuh-Kas?).[17] Such speculations cannot contribute much to a serious ethnic inquiry. *Kaššu* and *Kuššu* are abundantly attested names, derived evidently from the eponymous deity of the people; note e.g., the name of the Nuzian *hazannu* (of Kassite origin) known as *Kušši-Harbe* "Kushshi is lord" (Harbe = Bel).[18] To bring in a new term like *Kaspi* is to increase the confusion instead of reducing it; the problem is sufficiently complicated as it is.

---

[9] For the reading *bašḫu*, see *JRAS* 1917, 103. 22. Frank, *MF* 41, cites, however, *ma-aš-ḫu*; it is difficult to decide at present whether the confusion is due to the graphic similarity of the signs *ba* and *ma*, or to phonetic causes. Frank suggests an alternative reading *ma-aš-pak*, which is evidently based on such names as Shipak. But this reading remains to be proved.

[10] Cf. Forrer, *ZDMG* LXXVI 232. See also Hommel, *Ethnologie* 996.

[11] Forrer, *l. c.*, 234.

[12] *JRAS* 1917: 103. 17.

[13] So especially the change of *l* to *n*, cf. Forrer, *ib.* 235. The variations between *Lullu* and *Nullu*, *Haligalbat* and *Hanigalbat*, are among the most notable instances of that interchange in the Zagros area. Shroeder, *OLZ* 1917: 175, suggested that the writing *Ha-li-gal-ba-tu-ú* in the inscription of the Hurrian refugee *A-gab-ta-ha* (*MDEP* II, p. 95 f., and pl. 20) was due to a learned mannerism, and that the sign *li* was intended for *ana*, so that the gentilic form should be read *Hanagalbatū*. This suggestion is now definitely disproved by the form (*māt*)*Ha-li-gal-bat* (wr. with the sign ŠI, LIM), which occurs on a hitherto unpublished Nuzi text.

[14] Cf. L. W. King, *Chronicles of Early Kings* II p. 125. 10: "At the time of Shamshi-ditana Hattu against Akkad [marched]."

With the Hurrians we enter a field of unusually large scope. The Elamites, as has been shown previously, were the original, pre-Sumerian, population of Babylonia. The Hurrians furnished the substratum in Assyria with this essential difference: they entered more prominently into the make-up of the later Assyrians, than the Elamites appear to have done in the case of Sumer and Akkad. For the influence of the Hurrians upon Assyria was more fundamental and far-reaching than is ordinarily implied by mere political supremacy of limited duration; its effects are reflected also in the social institutions, and even in the physical characteristics of the Assyrian people.

---

[15] On the possibility of a similar formation in Gutian see ch. IV, n. 53.

[16] Cf. especially *Zagros* 24. Even the Akkadian word *kaspu* 'silver' is said to be connected with the name of the "Kaspi."

[17] Cf. *JRAS* 1925: 283. The meaning would be 'the Kas mountains.'

[18] Cf. e.g., Chiera, *Inheritance texts* 13. 22; 31. 37, etc. The name *Ku-uš-si-ia*, which is found in *HSS* V 73. 3, is a hypocoristic for Kušši-Harbe, or some similar compound. As for the above-mentioned *hazannu* of Nuzi, he was ultimately brought to court on a series of very grave charges, which are recorded in a number of very interesting and unusual documents. It is hoped that these most illuminating records will soon be published.

Let us first examine the cuneiform sources with a view to ascertaining the extent of the geographical distribution of the Hurrian elements. To take the oldest records first, the Sumerian name for the country in which the Hurri were to be found, viz., SUBIR, is found as early as the period of Lugal-anni-mundu, the pre-Sargonide ruler of the old city of Adab, hence, in the first quarter of the third millennium. The inscription of Lugal-anni-mundu has come down to us in a later copy from Isin, and the full import of this valuable document escapes us at present owing to its poor state of preservation. Fortunately, however, in several passages of the inscription the following sequence of countries is attested: Elam, Marhashi (the Sumerian writing for Barahshe), Gutium, Subir, Amurru (= MAR.TU) and Sutium.[19] This enumeration gives us a fair picture of Mesopotamia and the neighboring lands, as they were grouped into political units by the very early Sumerians.

The Akkadian form of *Subir* was *Subartu*, made on the analogy of land-names like *Elamtu*. The earliest datable occurrence of the fully spelled Akkadian rendering is probably to be seen in an inscription of Naram-Sin, where the Sumerian ideogram is glossed *šu-bar-tim*[20] (in the genitive, since the word is governed by KALAM). To be sure, the document in question is available only in a later copy (found at Ur), but we have no reason to suspect departures from the original text. The Naram-Sin inscription is also valuable for defining the position of Subartu. From the tablet which gives us the Sumerian record of Lugal-anni-mundu we have learned that Subir was placed between Gutium and Amurru, thus covering a large portion of northern Mesopotamia. The Akkadian text begins with the following statement: "Naram-Sin, king of Agade, governor? . . . of the land of Elam, all of it, as far as Barahshe, and the land of Subartu as far as the cedar forest."[21] This passage indicates, then, that Subartu extended from Barahshe, on the north-eastern border of Elam, up to the Amanus (the cedar-mountain), in the land of Amurru.[22] The term is used here in an even broader sense than by the above-mentioned king of Adab, as Gutium is not listed at all, being evidently included as part of Subartu. In the period of the Dynasty of Agade Subartu must have signified the whole of northern Mesopotamia. It is also obvious that the name had a purely geographical meaning; it could not have been used by Naram-Sin in an ethnic sense, since Subartu comprised also the country of the Guti, as we have seen, and perhaps even part of the Lullu districts. How the name *Subir* originated, we have not the means to determine at present. It may have been devised by the Sumerians, as was the case with NIM (Elam); or else, and perhaps more probably, it was derived from the name of some prominent northern city or district.[23] But we need not take up space with such necessarily inconclusive speculations.

---

[19] Cf. Poebel, *HGT* 75, especially col. 4. 10, and 27–28.

[20] *URI* 274, col. 1. 13.

It was, of course, inevitable that an ethnic designation should be abstracted from the name of so large a district as Subartu, which in later astrological terminology became one of "the four quarters of the world."[24] The people most peculiarly associated with that land must have been known from early times as the Subartu nation, which was distinct from such ethnic groups as the Lullu, the Gutians, or the Assyrians. Hammurabi appears to have employed the term Subartu in this more restricted sense, of a land occupied by a distinct type of population.[25] As a matter of fact, a special word was coined in course of time to signify that particular people; in Assyrian annals we find the "Shubarū," who bear the same relation to Subartu as the Elamites (Elamū) do to their country (Elamtu). But that restriction was not always observed; for even "Ashur" in the later sense (a country with a dominant Semitic element) is identified at times with "Subartu."[26]

---

[21] *Ib.*, 1–17.

[22] Cf. *ib.*, p. 73, note to col. 1.

[23] That there was actually a south Mesopotamian city by the name *Šubari* was indicated in ch. II, n. 48. This need not necessarily mean that the city in question was a "Subarean" center. All that we gather from this example is the fact that such place-names were known in Mesopotamia. It is possible, therefore, that a city or a district in the north, known as *Subir*, or the like, suggested the collective designation to the Sumerians.

[24] Cf., however, the remarks of Landsberger in *ZA* XXXV 218–219. From the point of view of the Assyrians, Subartu represented not the north, but the east, cf. Dhorme, *RB* 1928: 178.

We have thus obtained from the records of Sumer and Akkad information to the effect that from very early times northern Mesopotamia was known as Subartu; Assyrian sources have contributed the ethnic designation Shubaru. It now remains to collect and to compare the relevant data that may be found among the people of Subartu proper, and particularly in non-Mesopotamian sources, wherever possible. The inscription of Naram-Sin assigned to the land of Subartu a vaster territory than is given in cuneiform records to any other single political unit. It is reasonable, therefore, to expect references to so large a country in records other than from the river-lands only; and if the territory in question was largely peopled by a distinct ethnic group, there should also be indications of the existence of such a people in the extant inscriptions of the western neighbors of Subartu, similar to those that have been found in the east. It will be presently shown that these theoretical premises are correct, and that the ethnic element under discussion was well known in Syria, and also in Anatolia.

---

[25] Cf. especially Landsberger, *l. c.* 230 ff. For a criticism of Landsberger's view see Gadd, *Kirkuk* 66 f. That *Subartu* was not used exclusively for the district east of the Tigris is implied by the Naram-Sin inscription, *URI* 274. On the other hand, the material cited by Landsberger cannot be ignored altogether. Perhaps the difficulty can be obviated if we distinguish clearly between the ethnic and the geographical significations of the term. Originally the word had a purely geographic connotation, and it applied, it would seem exclusively, to the region east of the Tigris. Subsequently the land came to be occupied by a distinct ethnic group, upon whom the name of the land was transferred. Since the people in question were not confined, however, to Subartu proper, but had important settlements in the middle-Euphrates area as well, the name *Subartu* was extended to include also the other territories occupied by the group in question. I believe that this explanation does justice to all the available data on the subject. That the native ethnic designation of the people under discussion was not connected with the name *Subartu* will be presently demonstrated.

[26] Cf. Ungnad, *Beiträge zur Assyriologie* VI 5. 20.

Before proceeding any further, however, it is in place to indicate how the scattered members of this very large family can be recognized in their various surroundings. The necessary criteria have come from the land of Mitanni. As is well known, there existed in the middle-Euphrates area, at the time that is now familiar through the Amarna Letters (about the middle of the second millennium) an independent and influential political entity, known from the contemporary records as Mitanni. For a period of several centuries the kingdom of Mitanni was one of the four powers in the Near East, on par with Egypt, the Hittite empire, and Babylonia (Kashshu).[27] The Amarna Letters include among others several long messages from the rulers of Mitanni (who resided in their capital Washshuganni) to the pharaohs of Egypt. By a very fortunate coincidence, there has also been preserved a letter from one of the Mitannian kings, Tushratta, which was for some unknown reason composed in the language of his country, instead of the usual Akkadian that had come to be the diplomatic speech of the Near East. The letter in question is probably the longest document of its kind preserved in the cuneiform script (about 600 verses). Although its language was otherwise unknown, it was possible to decipher the valuable record with a fair degree of certainty, owing to the numerous ideographic writings that were well known from Sumerian, and with constant reference to similar documents which have come down to us in Akkadian. In the decipherment of this new language Jensen, Messerschmidt, and particularly Bork[28] rendered very valuable service; the last mentioned scholar has also advanced the theory, not without a show of reason, that the language of Tushratta's letter was a branch of the "Caucasian" family.

---

[27] Cf. Bilabel, *Geschichte*, ch. XI.

Now it is well known that the country of Mitanni was also called at times the land of *Subari*.[29] To be sure, this usage is not found in the records of the Mitannian kings themselves, but only in the letters of the governor of Byblos, and once in a message from a north Syrian official; but these occurrences are sufficient to establish the fact that (*māt*)*Mitanni* was included in the more general designation *Subartu*, at least by the scribes who wrote in Akkadian. Moreover, in Akkadian lexicographical notes some other words are assigned to Subartu that clearly belong to the speech of Mitanni;[30] on the other hand, the notes also include good Akkadian terms,[31] so that we must assume the same loose usage of *Subartu* in a linguistic sense that we have already shown as prevalent in geographical contexts. At any rate, enough material is now available to recognize "Mitannian" linguistic elements outside of the middle-Euphrates area. Such elements have been found to the east of Mitanni proper, namely in the lands of Urkish and Namar,[32] and especially in the area of Arrapha, which corresponds to the modern district of Kirkuk. We have at present several thousand records from Arrapha; they are written invariably in Akkadian, but the overwhelming majority of the personal names belongs indisputably to the "Mitannian" or Subartu group.

---

[28] *Die Mitannisprache*, in *MVAG* XIV 1/2 (1909). For further literature cf. Chiera and Speiser, "A New Factor in the History of the Ancient East," *AASOR* VI 76 ff. The results of Bork have been recently subjected to severe criticism on the part of H. Sköld, "Sur la lettre en langue Mitanni," *JRAS* 1926 667–678, which is for the most part unjustified. Cf. Friedrich, *Indogermanisches Jahrbuch* XII (1928) 321. See also the reply of Bork in *JRAS* 1928; 51–62. Bork has contributed to this note a number of new and valuable observations on the subject. But he certainly goes too far in changing the name *Mitanni* into *Mitlani*. The presence of the peculiar *tl* sound in the Zagros and related languages is a well known fact. However, this does not necessarily imply that the *t*-sound in *Mitanni* had the same quality. From the letter of Saushshatar (*JAOS* 49. 269–275) we learn that the older form of the name was *Ma-i-te-ni*; there is here no trace of an unusual treatment of the dental in question.

[29] Cf. Knudtzon, *Amarna* 100. 21; 109. 40. In 108. 17 occurs the suggestive writing (*māt*)*Su-ri*, which however, is undoubtedly due to an error.

[30] Cf. Landsberger, *l. c.*, 228.

[31] So already Jensen, *ZA* VI 60, n. 1. Cf. now also Frank, *MF* 43–45. See further *AASOR* VI 79 and Bilabel, *Geschichte* 250 f.

The Boghaz-koi archives have also yielded their share of records which clearly belong to the same group. Happily, the Anatolian material consists of connected texts in the language under discussion,[33] and not merely of proper names and sundry phrases as is the case in Arrapha. Furthermore, the Hittite sources have also transmitted to us the name by which the language was known, as well as the ethnic designation for their eastern neighbors who used that particular speech: the former is repeatedly designated as *Hur-lili*,[34] while the people were called *Hur-lēš* (also *Hur-lāš*, and *Hur-luš*,[35] all three forms being in the plural). The gentilic form in the singular was *Hur-lū*, the full spelling of which is *Hu-u-ur-lu-u*,[36] thus settling definitely the problem of the stem vowel; for generally the name is written with sign ḪAR, ḪUR, MUR and the readings Harri and even Murri were adopted by several scholars,[37] which resulted in the setting up of confusing ethnic theories. Now that the reading *Hurri* (without the Hittite endings) may be regarded as absolutely certain,[38] it is possible to trace with confidence the appearance of the same important element in non-cuneiform sources. In passing it may be added that the *Hur-ri* land is also mentioned in the Amarna Letters; the Mitanni letter deals repeatedly with the (*KUR*)*Hurrū-he*, or *Hurwū-he*,[39] the suffix belonging this time to the group of which the name is descriptive.

---

[32] Cf. Barton, *RISA* p. 170. 1. Material from neighboring districts has been collected by Landsberger, *l.c.*, 229. The author cites, among others, the name *Dup-ki-še-ir* (from Langdon, Drehem no. 47), but he indicates that the "Subarean" character of the name is uncertain. Now *Dupki-* is one of the most common elements in the personal names from Kirkuk. On the other hand, *še-ir* is doubtful; it is found in the names of the mythical rulers *Mes-kinga-šer* and *Laba-šer*. I consider the *ir* of *Dup-ki-še-ir* an error for *ni*, and read the name *Dupkišeni*, which is perfectly good Hurrian. Cf. *e.g.*, *Dup-ki-še-en-ni*, *HSS* V. 93. 4. The element *še-ir* of the other names is evidently authentic, but I have no explanation for it.

[33] Cf. the Hurrian fragment of the Gilgamesh Epic, published in KBo VI 33, and edited and annotated by Ungnad, *ZA* XXXV 133–140.

[34] Cf. Forrer, *ZDMG* LXXVI 188, 195 ff.

[35] See now the article of Hrozný, entitled "Churri," *Archiv Orientální* (*AOR*) I (1929) 91 ff. Hrozný makes a number of new points, but he repeats also some

Palestinian and Egyptian sources must now be reviewed briefly in connection with the problem which we have been discussing. The Bible includes, as is well known, among the oldest inhabitants of Palestine a people called the *Ḥorites.*

---

of the conclusions which were reached by Chiera and Speiser, *A New Factor*, in 1926, without knowing, of course, of the earlier publication.

[36] Cf. the Hittite text published by Sturtevant in the *Transactions of the American Philological Association* LVIII (1927) col. 1. 2 (p. 6). The importance of this passage is recognized by Hrozný, *l. c.* 92.

[37] Weidner still maintains the position of Winckler, who connected the "Ḫarri" with the Aryans (Indo-Iranians), cf. *AfO* V 93, n. 3. The evidence is overwhelmingly against this view, but until Weidner has published his arguments in full, no criticism can be attempted. It is safe to assume, however, that Weidner will not attack the linguistic position of Hurrian, which is definitely a non-Indo-European language. I must abstain here from citing the extensive literature on the subject. As for the reading *Murri*, Sayce would adopt it and connect the name with that of the *Amurru*, and it is surprising that Bork, too, is now in favor of this reading, cf. *JRAS* 1928: 61. But the evidence in favor of *Hurri* is now sufficiently copious and unambiguous to establish the form in question beyond reasonable doubt.

[38] For the literature on the subject cf. Chiera and Speiser, *A New Factor* 77, n. 6, to which should be added Hrozný, *AOR* I 92.

[39] Cf. Knudtzon, *Amarna* 1575. *Hurri* and *Mitanni* are interchangeable occasionally in Hittite annals; cf. Bilabel, *Geschichte* 250.

The Egyptian records of the Middle-Dynastic period introduce the term; *H̱ꜣrw* (*ẖur*) which ultimately supplants *Retenu* as a general designation for Syria and Palestine.[40] The Biblical and Egyptian names are now generally connected by scholars. The present question is to determine the further relations of these Horites, who must have represented an important element, judging from the Egyptian usage. The connection with the above-mentioned Hurri suggests itself immediately, and the Septuagint transcription of the Biblical *H̱ori* as Χορραῖος (note the double consonant) is a further corroborative argument. Moreover, the Septuagint version leads also to the assumption that the Horites were originally more prominent in the Old Testament than is apparent from the present Hebrew text. For in two very significant instances, in connection with the Gibeonites[41] and in the story of Shechem,[42] the Greek version has Χορραῖος in place of the Hebrew חוי. The latter case is particularly interesting in view of the fact that Shechem has been, from the earliest Biblical times up to the present day, the seat of anti-government propaganda. The Septuagint indication that the city was inhabited originally by a non-Semitic population throws a good deal of light upon the subject. The confusion between חרי and חוי is easily explained by the graphic similarity of the two words. The Hebrew text itself shows at least one clear instance of such a change. In Gen. 36.2 the word חוי occurs in place of חרי, but the latter reading is found in v. 20 of that chapter, although both verses deal with the same family. It appears, then, that the Horites were originally more wide-spread than the present text indicates. It is not improbable that popular etymology had something to do with restricting that people to the district of Edom. The word חרי was from early times interpreted as 'cave-dweller'; the presence of troglodytes in the mountains of Edom could be accounted for without difficulty, but their appearance in central Palestine might not have been equally obvious. It is well known that modern scholars have often accepted this etymology;[43] in fact, Hrozny has recently extended the same interpretation to the Mesopotamian *Hurri* as well, deriving the word from Akkadian *ḫurru*.[44] Personally, I consider it very doubtful that the name has anything to do with Semitic roots. Since the name *Hurri* is so well attested in Hittite sources, it appears to me much more likely that we have here the native term used by the Hurrians themselves.

---

[40] See Müller, *Asien und Europa* 137, 148 ff.; Spiegelberg, *OLZ* 1906: 106 f.

[41] Jos. 9. 7; In Jos. 11. 19 the Septuagint omits the reference to the Hiwwites.

[42] Gen. 34. 2. Cf. E. Meyer, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme* (1906) 331, 336. Professors Montgomery and Hoschander were good enough to call my attention to the Septuagint passages.

The assumption of a large Hurrian settlement in Palestine does not rest merely on speculations, but is now established by the evidence of the proper names found in the tablets from Tell Taʿannek, in the Valley of Jezreel. The material has been recently studied by Gustavs, with the interesting result that the Hurrian names have been shown to form the second largest group in the extant records, exceeded only by the Canaanite elements.[45] To be sure, this applies only to a limited section of Palestine at the middle of the second millennium. On the other hand, it will be remembered that the Valley of Jezreel is not mentioned in the Old Testament as a Horite center; the presumption, therefore, is that a similar ratio would obtain for the same period in other Palestinian districts as well.

---

[43] For literature cf. Gesenius-Buhl, *a.l.* The terse criticism of Ungnad is: "Mit den 'Höhlenmenschen' in Palästina ist es nichts," cf. *ZA* XXXV 133, n. 1.

[44] Cf. *AOR* I 98. On the possible connections between the name *Hurri* and the designations for Edessa/Urfa see *ib.* I do not consider these speculations absolutely convincing, though a certain degree of probability cannot be denied them.

[45] Cf. Gustavs, *Die Personennamen in den Tontafeln von Tell Taʿannek* (Leipzig, 1928).

That the Horites were more numerous in Palestine before the Canaanite invasion is a very probably hypothesis, though we cannot prove it at present. The archaeological material that may be adduced in partial support of such an assumption will be discussed below. It may be added that a thorough study of the non-Semitic place-names in Palestine is at present an urgent desideratum. Much has been made of the name Jordan, by connecting it with various European, and especially Cretan, elements;[46] but in matters of this kind cumulative evidence only may justify further conclusions for ethnic purposes.

There is still another source of information concerning the extent of the early Hurrian settlements in Palestine. It has been demonstrated in several recent studies that the Biblical references to the Hittites apply, in reality, to the Hurrians.[47] After the conquest of the Mitanni kingdom by the Hittites, the latter remained for some time the principal political power in northern Syria, thus lending their name to numerous linguistic and cultural elements that had been formerly known as Hurrian. In this way the Israelites came to consider as Hittite much that they knew to be non-Semitic. To the Assyrians the entire west was "Hittite," so that even the inhabitants of the Philistine city of Asdod are called "the faithless Hatti."[48] For similar reasons it has been suggested that the hitherto undeciphered "Hittite" hieroglyphs are with more probability Hurrian.[49] At all events, the Palestinian "Hittites" of the time of Abraham were at best proto-Hittites

---

[46] See E. Meyer, *GA* I. 2 (4th ed.) 476 and E. Hommel, "Der Name und die Legende des Jordan in altkanaanäischer Zeit," *JSOR* XI (1927) 169 ff.

[47] Cf. Ungnad, *Kulturfragen* 1. 7, Chiera and Speiser, *A New Factor* 78, n. 13, and Gustavs, *o.c.*, 14 ff.

[48] See Chiera-Speiser *l. c.* There is no excuse whatever for hopelessly confusing "Mitanni" with Hittite in so recent a work as *CAH* I. XI. For practically every "Hittite" in that chapter we must substitute "Mitanni."

[49] Cf. Ungnad, *l. c.*, 8, n. 1.

(i.e. the Hattic group); it is, of course, quite possible that Hattic and Hurrian settlements were to be found side by side in the Palestine of the third millennium, just as they must be assumed for eastern Anatolia (and perhaps the northernmost sections of Syria) a number of centuries later.

Having sketched briefly the unusually large expanse of Hurrian linguistic and ethnic elements, we will now take up the question of the name by which the entire group may best be known. I have been using the term "Hurrian" in the preceding pages, although it was previously shown that the cuneiform records from Mesopotamia operate with the names Subir, Subartu, and Shubaru. In fact, till Ungnad revived the "Subareans," who had been originally introduced by Jensen, "Mitanni" and its derivatives were the commonly accepted labels for the entire family. It is clear, however, that Mitanni is a purely political name, brought doubtless by the "Indic" ruling class to whom the organization of the Mitannian kingdom was due in all probability; the name *Mitanni* goes back to an older *Maiteni*, as I have recently shown, and the word is most likely Indo-European in origin.[50] The geographical name for the area covered by the kingdom of Mitanni was *Hanigalbat* or *Haligalbat*, which is employed, among others, in the Kirkuk tablets. But names of districts could not be used very well to comprise ethnic groups such as the Hurrians. Now the same objection applies largely to the name Subartu and its derivatives. As we have seen, Subartu was originally a geographical name, from which ethnic and linguistic designations were later abstracted. Not infrequently Subartu was used in an inexact way. This is true not only of geographic contexts, but also of the lexicographical passages in which a given word is explained as "Subarean"; for it is well known that among the latter there are some perfectly good Akkadian words with obvious Semitic etymologies.[51] The name "Subarean" is thus liable to introduce considerable confusion. On the other hand "Hurrian" is well attested in its geographical, ethnic, and linguistic applications; it was evidently the native term; its use is far more precise than that of "Subarean." Ungnad himself has admitted that "Hurrian" is in some instances the preferable name ("genauer wohl Hurriter.").[52] Since the Hurrian fragments from Boghazkoi are admittedly all but identical in language with the letter of Tushratta, it would be awkward to call the former by their local name, while applying "Subarean" to the latter. And to speak of "Subareans" in Palestine, despite the Biblical and the Egyptian evidence, is certainly placing the entire subject altogether out of focus. I would not deny that in Mesopotamia "Subartu" managed to get citizen rights; at the same time, however, the overwhelming evidence of the remaining centers is all in favor of the name "Hurri." This term is now employed by a considerable number of scholars, and it is perhaps not unreasonable to hope that before long there may be complete unanimity on this not unimportant problem of terminology.

---

[50] *JAOS* 49. 269 ff.; cf. also Hrozný, *AOR* I 103 ff. The new Indo-European names which the letter of Saushshatar has added to the growing list are Parsatatar, and Satawatti. I do not know what to do with the former as regards etymology, but the latter appears to contain the element *satya* 'true' and possibly *vādin* 'speaking.' At all events, the final element cannot be disassociated from the same component in *Te-ú-wa-at-ti*, the name of a Syrian prince of the Amarna period, cf. Knudzton, *Amarna*, 1569. The above etymology was suggested with due caution by my colleague Professor W. N. Brown.

We may now pass on to a rapid review of the more characteristic philological elements that enable us to single our Hurrian material from among other contexts. I have indicated previously that Bork has succeeded in establishing numerous points of similarity between Hurrian and some Caucasian languages.[53] Important is the fact that Hurrian observes the same distinction between animate and inanimate groups that is noticeable in Elamite, and is, among others, characteristic of "Caucasian" languages. Hurrian and Elamite share also notable peculiarities of phonology, and to a lesser degree of morphology; the etymological equipment of both languages is in several significant details also identical.[54] At the same time there are marked differences between the two forms of speech. We must remember, however, that almost all the Hurrian material that is available at present belongs to the second millennium. At that time Elamite and Hurrian were opposed to one another geographically as eastern and western linguistic families. The period in which the two may be assumed to have been united cannot be placed less than two thousand years earlier. During so long a time many individual developments could have taken place, which we are not in a position to trace at present because of the scantiness of the extant sources. Different influences from without would also have to be taken into consideration. In short, there is nothing in the material that is available for a comparative study of Hurrian and Elamite, which would be inconsistent with the assumption that the two languages developed from a common source. The alternative assumption of a close pro-ethnic relationship, if not actual identity, of the eastern and western groups under discussion is very probable; it receives additional support from the independent evidence of archaeology, while historical and geographical considerations yield their share to the imposing body of cumulative evidence. On the other hand, the much too fragmentary character of the relevant philological data precludes for the present any possibility of a definite and unassailable identification on linguistic grounds. We cannot, for instance, compare in this case such significant parts of speech as the numerals, for the simple reason that these are not spelled out in the cuneiform script. Equally decisive would be the evidence of pronouns, which belong, as is well known, to those components of a linguistic group that resist change most stubbornly. But here, too, the available material is incomplete; it may be added that Hüsing and Bork have succeeded, nevertheless, in establishing the identity of several pronominal elements of Hurrian and of Elamite.[55] All in all, we must be satisfied with sundry indications that are strongly in favor of an ultimate identity between Hurrian on the one hand, and Elamite with its relations, on the other. A more definite position on this subject would, to my thinking, be entirely premature.

---

[51] Cf. n. 31.

[52] Cf. *Kulturfragen* 1. 8, n. 1.

[53] Cf. his *Mitannisprache* 68 ff.

---

[54] *Ib.* 78 ff. For promoninal correspondences cf. Bork, *JRAS* 1928. 58. Whether the Hurrian subject-suffix *-š* (in reality *-s*) corresponds to the Elamite *-r* (through rhotacism in the latter) still requires further study to determine.

Hurrian has been so far compared with Elamite rather than with the other eastern languages, such as Lullu, Kassite, and Gutian, because we have no continuous texts of the three last-named dialects; also because Elamite may be provisionally regarded as representative of the entire eastern group. In the case of Hurrian, we have not only the lengthy "Mitannian" letter of Tushratta, as well as the Hurrian fragments from Boghazkoi, but also a very large number of proper names, which may now be counted in thousands. In the study of the Hurrian onomastic material, Bork, Ungnad, P. Scheil, Landsberger, Gadd, Contenau, and especially Gustavs,[56] have all rendered valuable service. The material which the present writer has collected would require a well-sized volume for a full treatment. For the present, it will be again necessary to restrict the discussion to such details as may prove important for comparative purposes.

---

[55] Cf. *JRAS l. c.*

[56] An exhaustive bibliography would carry us too far afield. Cf. Contenau, *Les tablettes de Kerkouk et les origines de la civilisation assyrienne* (reprinted from *Babyloniaca* IX, Paris, 1926) 13–14, and Gustavs, *RV* VIII 218–226, to which should be added the same author's *Personennamen in den Tontafeln von Tell Ta'annek.* A preliminary report on the material from Qaṭna, which contains Hurrian names, is given by Virolleaud, in "Les tablettes cunéiformes de Mishrifé-Ḳaṭna," *Syria* IX (1928) 90–96.

As regards phonology, to begin with, we notice in Hurrian the same loose treatment in rendering voiced and voiceless stops that has been previously noticed in the eastern group, and which is also characteristic of the languages of the Hittite area. The real reason for this apparent failure to distinguish between the two classes of stops cannot be determined as yet. Perhaps the sounds in question were in this entire group of a type which is intermediate between voiced and voiceless; or else, such distinctions as may have actually existed could not be adequately expressed in the cuneiform writing.

Another phonetic peculiarity of Hurrian, which is also shared by the eastern group, is illustrated by the interchange of *r* and *l*. Thus *amurri* becomes *amuli*, as in *Šaramuli*[57] and *Kiltamuli*;[58] *Gi-el-šu* interchanges with *Gi-ir-šu*;[59] the feminine name *Wuluia* is also written *Wuruia*,[60] etc.

Of the elements used in the formation of personal names we may distinguish broadly between nominal (including adjectival) and verbal formatives. Of the former, the most common are *r* and *h*, usually with an overhanging vowel. Thus (*a*)*ri* indicates primarily that the person in question hails from a given place; e.g. *Ninua-ri*, *Arrapha-ri*, *Nawar-ari*, *Hana-ri*;[61] meaning 'the man from Nineveh, Arrapha,' and the like. The local connotation, however, is not always evident: cf. *e.g.*, *Wirra-ri*,[62] *Tura-ri*, *Giluma-ri*, *Qati-ri*; we may also note here such names as *Qari-ru*, *Šeqa-ru*(*m*), and many others which end in a syllable containing the *r*-sound. The latter loses its overhanging vowel when the whole word forms the first element of a composite name; e.g., *Tura-r-Tešup*, as compared with *Tura-ri*.[63]

---

[57] *HSS* V 12. 28.

[58] Unpublished text, *H* 325. 4.

[59] *HSS* V 79. 34, and *ib.* 42.

[60] *Ib.*, 16. 3; 41. 1.

[61] Cf. the list of proper names in Gadd, *Kirkuk* 71 ff.

[62] Gadd, *l. c.* p. 79 (no. 359) reads *Pi-ir-ra-ri*, which is wrong, because in the Kirkuk tablets *PI* has always the value of *w* plus vowel. Contenau, l.c., p.113, cites the name *Wi-ir-ra-ah.*

It will be remembered that the *r*-termination is particularly well represented in the eastern group of the languages and dialects under discussion, where it is also found in place-names. In the latter application it also occurs in the Hurrian area; cf. e.g., the name of the city *Hurazina-war*.[63a] Undoubtedly the ending in question was specialized in the different groups for various purposes, but this is not the place to trace the finer distinctions in usage.

As regards the ending *-h*, we have had occasion to note its application in place-names. It is no less common in personal names. Without the overhanging vowel, we find this element in *Gurpaza-h*, *Hilpišu-h*,[64] *Tarwaza-h*,[65] and many others; with the vowel it occurs in such names as *Nulaza-hi*, *ᶠHawurniš-he*,[66] and with an additional formative *na* in *Ewi-hi-na*,[67] and the like. Since *-h* is a very common adjectival suffix in Hurrian, it is natural to find it in a number of Hurrian words such as *pai-hu* (adjective modifying 'field'), *sehal-hi* (descriptive of 'road'), *mikuh-he* (in connection with 'gate'), etc.; with a further formative *-na* we may cite the word *kurza-hhe-na*. To turn for a moment to land-names, *-hi* is found not only in such Mesopotamian districts as *Kir-hi*, and *Kummu-hi*, but also in the very significant designation *Kina-hhi* 'Canaan.' Now that we have seen how important the Hurrian element was in Palestine, the probability that the native name of the country is also of Hurrian origin need not be considered as surprising. It was also indicated above that the ending *-hi/he* appears in ethnic terms like *Hurru-he*, *Kuššu-hai*, and very likely also in "*Cardu-chi*."[68]

---

[63] Cf. the list of Gadd, *nos*. 137–138.

[63a] Written also GUŠKIN.TUR, Gadd 53. 14. A place, probably a gate, is called *Ma-hi-ri-mar* in *HSS* V 17. 30. From the tablet of Arisen (Barton, *RISA* 170) we get the name of the country of *Nawar* (cf. also Landsberger, *ZA* XXXV 229), later *Namri*, see *Orientalia* 36–38, p. 132. In this connection attention should also be called to Cappadocian place-names like Shaladuwar; and lastly, also names like *Haš-mar*, ch. IV.

[64] Cf. *JAOS* 47. 55, vs. 5–6.

[65] Gadd, *l. c.* 69. 2. The name is written *Tar-wa-a-ah*, but the *a* is probably a mistake for *za*.

[66] Cf. the list of Gadd, *l. c.*

[67] *Ib.* 1. 26. Cf. also the Cappadocian names *Arawarhina* and *Arawurhina*, cited by Landsberger, *l. c.* 221. This is another instance of connections between Hurrian and Cappadocian elements (cf. also the name *Kik(k)ia*, see above, ch. IV, n. 77). The same ending appears in the place-name *A/Ur-Zuhina* (northwest of Arrapha), and in the word *kurzahhena*, Chiera, *Inheritance Texts* 86. 4. Without the element *-h*, the ending *-na* is found in place-names like *Te-im-te-na*, *HSS* V 69. 15, *etc.*

The sibilants are prominently represented as formatives in Hurrian proper names. The interesting element *-izz-i*, which recalls the common Anatolian *-iss-*, appears in *Arz-izz-a*,[69] *Ak-izz-i*,[70] while *Haniku-(i)zzi*, and *Kinnu-(i)zz-i* have lost their *i* after a back-vowel. The same is probably true of *Nu-uzz-a*, unless the name be derived from the place-name *Nuzi*. Equally common are combinations with *-šš-* (doubtless pronounced *-ss-*); cf. *Kar-išš-e*, *Hutipura-šš-e*, etc. Simple *-š-* is found in feminine names such as *Kira-š-e*, *Kipašeqa-š-e*, and the like.[71] The same termination has already been observed in place-names, notably in *Paharra-še*,[72] which we have compared with the Elamitic *B/Parah-še/si*. Obviously we have in the latter instances the suffix *-š* with the overhanging vowel *i/e*. Whether the same analysis also applies to the feminine names in *-še*, it is probably too early to determine. The *-še* of the masculine names, on the other hand, is clearly an abbreviation for the very frequent element *šenni* 'brother.'

---

[68] See above, ch. IV. In the Kirkuk tablets *kinahhi* is used as an adjective (without determinative for country) to denote a special type of wool imported from the west (unpublished test H3.13); here the word is employed as a trade-name. Incidentally, this is probably the oldest mention of "Canaan" in literature.

[69] *HSS* V 23. 1, and *passim*. Again it is impossible to disconnect this personal name from place-names like *Ar-zi-zu* (Ashurnasirpal, *Annals* 2. 73), and *Zi-iz-za* (*HSS* V 54. 12).

[70] The name of the king of Qaṭna known from the Amarna letters, cf. Knudtzon, *Amarna*, nos. 52–55. Cf. also the name of the city *Ruh-izzi*, ib. 53. 36.

[71] For the above names cf. the list of Gadd, and *HSS* 71. 1.

[72] *JAOS* 49. 272.

In composite names we meet frequently with the verbal formative *-ib* (*-ef*), which is said to signify the desiderative mood;[73] e.g., *Tehi-p-tilla*, *Haši-p-Tešup*,[74] *Elhi-p-šarri*, and many others. As a nominal element we find the labial in *Kulahu-pi*, *Tamqalam-pi*,[74a] etc.

In surveying the suffixes and formatives which are best represented in Hurrian, we have thus found in this group the same prevalence of liquid, labial, and sibilant elements that has previously been noticed in the eastern group. It goes without saying that the correspondence may be due in a number of instances to coincidence and nothing else. Certainly, it is not advisable to adduce these facts as decisive proofs of ethnic relationships. On the other hand, the regular recurrence of very much the same elements in all the dialects hitherto discussed, justifies at least the tentative assumption that some of those similarities may be due to an ultimately identical source. The most notable difference in this respect is perhaps the *-h* of Hurrian, which appears to have taken the place of the *k*-suffix in the Elamitic group. Off hand, one might be tempted to assume a phonetic relation between the two formatives, especially since *k* and *h* do actually interchange in the highland zone in a few significant instances, as e.g., in *Tarhu* over against *Tarku*.[75] However, such a connection is very doubtful, and it is far more sound to suspend judgment in so important a case.

---

[73] Bork, *Mitannisprache* 54.

[74] *HSS* V 15.3. The other names are to be found in the list of Gadd, to which I have referred so frequently because it is easily accessible.

[74a] This reading is preferable to Gadd's *Pir*(?)*qalambi* (*Kirkuk* 45. 19, text) in view of the frequent value *tam* for UD in the Nuzi texts; cf. also the name (*al*) *Te-im-te-na*.

The use of one other suffix should be briefly indicated in this connection. By the side of *-hi* Hurrian employs also the ending *-ti*, mostly in substantives denoting inanimate things. Thus from the verb *ar* 'to give' we get a noun *ar-ti* 'gift.' This *-ti* is doubtless related to the same element in the Elamitic group, which is also used in the formation of land and city-names. From *Lullu-bi* is formed the name *Lullu-ba-ti*,[76] which means the 'country of the *Lullu-bī*.' Similarly we have names like *Kilamba-te*,[77] *Sangibu-tu/ti*;[78] and the old name of the Lullu capital, *Arak-di*,[79] (and perhaps even *Aga-de*?) contains, no doubt, the same characteristic suffix, without the plural element *b*.[80] Philologically related to this onomastic group is probably the land-name *Hanigalbat*, used, as we have seen, in connection with the district in which centered the kingdom of Mitanni. If this supposition is correct, the name signified originally 'the land of the Hani-galla-bi;' it is indeed very significant that the name *Hani* is occasionally substituted for the fuller term Hanigalbat,[81] thus proving quite conclusively that the other elements (*gal*(*la*)-*b*-*t*) were merely qualifying formatives.[82] The absence of the overhanging vowel after the final *t* does not constitute an obstacle to this view. For as early as the Dynasty of Agade we find a king of Urkish and Namar, who bears the good Hurrian name *A-ri-si-en*;[83] here the well-known component *šenni* (cf. *Puhi-šenni*, *Aki-p-ta-šenni*, etc.) occurs without the final vowel. The same treatment may be observed in the name of the father of Arisen *Sada-r-mat* (*Sá-dar-ma-at*); the last part of the compound is *mati*, as in Nuzian *Enna-mati*, but the overhanging vowel is again missing. It appears, then, that the presence of the final *i* was, in many instances, either due to dialectal peculiarities, or else it marked a later development.[84]

---

[75] For compounds with *Tarhu* in the cuneiform literature cf. Clay, *Personal Names of the Cassite Period*, p. 137. *Tarku* does not occur in the Nippur texts, however, as is still occasionally stated. The name which Clay first misread as *Tar-ku-a-bu* was later corrected by him into *Haš-ma-a-bu*, *ib*. 205. But the name *Turgu* occurs in compounds, *ib*. 204. Cf. also Bork, *Mitanni-Sprache* 80.

[76] Cf. *Irra Myth*, *Beiträge zur Assyriologie* II 477. 14.

[77] Cf. Thureau-Dangin, *Sargon* line 43.

[78] *Ib*., *passim*, cf. Introd. VIII n. 4.

[79] Ashurnasirpal, *Annals* 2. 77.

[80] To the same class belongs probably the name of the well known city of *Lub-di*, whose labial appears to be part of the stem. As for *(al)Ha-ba-te*, Gadd, *Kirkuk* 62. 2, the function of the final syllable is as above, but the rôle of *-ba-* is difficult to determine. Cf. further the name of the city *Za-mi-te*, *HSS* V 57. 10. On the other hand, we cannot include in this group *(al)Ku-ni-na-di*, Gadd, *Kirkuk* no. 544, because the final *di* is a scribal error for *ki*; the text, *ib*. 4. 3f., should read: *eqlāti ina (al)Ku-ni-na ki-mu 3 imer* . . . The number of other place-names in *ti/te* is large. But we cannot include in this class *Gu-ti* and *Su-ti*, as Hüsing would have it (*Zagros* 22); for the *ti* in *Guti* is evidently part of the stem, as is made probable by the example of *ma-da Gu-te-bu-um*(*ki*), cf. ch. IV n. 73; *Suti* designates Semitic nomads, which rules it out from the present discussion. Without the overhanging vowel we have further "*Ia-ab-ra-at*, the man of Subartu," cf. Frank, *MF* 43, n. 2, and the above-mentioned river-name *Ṭur-na-at*. Cf. also *(māt)Tu-na-na-at*, Knudtzon, *Amarna* 53. 43, a name which occurs in the Qaṭna texts in connection with other Hurrian designations.

---

[81] Cf. Chiera-Speiser, *A New Factor* 78, n. 13.

[82] Cf. the names (*māt*)*Ia-su-bi* and (*māt*)*Ia-su-bi-gal-la-ia*, *Orientalia* 36–38, p. 85. Worth noting is also the name of the city *Anzu-galli*, *HSS* V 29. 9; 41. 7, etc.

[83] Barton, *RISA* 170.

[84] Landsberger, *ZA* XXXV 230, n. 2, cites several personal names ending in *-at*, from the districts of Harshi, Humurti, and Kimash. We have seen that the districts in question lay in the Arrapha region (cf. Poebel, *ZA* XXXIX 138 f.). It may be noted that *Humur-ti* shows the suffix *-ti* which we have just been discussing. Landsberger further considers the possibility of connecting the names in question with Hanigalbat, which is precisely the conclusion of the present writer.

Before leaving the subject of place-names from the region of Arrapha, I wish to call attention to the fact that the common name (*al*)*Tur-ša* (the similarity to *Tur*(*u*)*sha*, one of the "Peoples of the Sea," is striking but meaningless for the present) is also found in the writing (*al*)*Tur-ša-an*, cf. Chiera, *Inheritance texts* 44. 4 (other suffixes occur in texts that are still unpublished). Thus we find the Elamite-Lullu-Gutian ending *-an* represented in Hurrian as well; it is

In concluding this part of the discussion, it may be useful to cite a few other Hurrian words (not merely suffixes), which appear most frequently in name-compounds.[85] Of the verbal elements that may be employed for such purposes the most common are: *haš*, *ak*, *ar*,[86] *ehli* or *elhi*;[87] *tehi*, *ithi*, and *utha*;[88] *gili* and *gel*.[89] Among the nouns often used in the formation of composite names may be noted: *iwri* or *irwi*,[90]

---

very likely that other Hurrian place-names in *-a* (not including *-wa*, which is a genitive/locative suffix) go back similarly to an older *-an*. It will be recalled that *Awan* becomes *Awak* upon the addition of the subject determinative *-k* (cf. ch. II n. 54).

[85] A discussion of Kirkuk names is given also in Contenau, *Tablettes de Kerkouk* 109 ff. Contenau's study appeared before the bulk of the Kirkuk material that is now available had been published, which accounts for the inaccuracies in the list of the proper names. Why Contenau should have read *Bag-u-ia* (p. 134) for the more obvious and certainly correct *Hu-u-ia*, I do not know; the comparison with the Iranian (?) *baga* 'god' (the question mark is Contenau's) may have induced the far-fetched reading.

[86] This element is particularly common, both in personal and in place-names. Cf. e.g., *Ar-rapha*, *Ar-akdi* (a mound near *Arakdi* bears the very characteristic name *Ar-bat*, cf. Speiser, *AASOR* VIII, map) *Ur/Ar-bilum*, *Ur/Ar-Zuhina*, and many others; *Zuhina* in the last-named designation represents probably the name of a river. The land *Ur-arṭu* is particularly rich in place-names beginning with *ar*, which is quite natural in view of the fact that Haldian (the language of Urarṭu) was very closely related to Hurrian.

[87] Cf. e.g., *Ehli-Tešup*, *HSS* V 48. 17 and *Elhi-p-tilla*, *ib*. 14. 13. In a different ablaut grade we find the same element in *Ehel-Tešup*, *ib*. 90. 2.

[88] E. g., *Tehi-p-tilla* as compared with *Ithi-p-šarri*, Gadd, *Kirkuk* 25. 10 (transliteration only), and *Utha-p-tae*, *HSS* V 48. 5. The *p* (verbal desiderative element) is assimilated before *n* as in *Ithi-n-Namar*, Gadd, *o.c.* 32. 9.

[89] *Gili-p-šarri*, Gadd, *o.c.* 29. 6, and *Gel-Tešup* *HSS* V 77. 1, with the same ablaut gradation as in *ehli/ehel*.

[90] *Iwri-š* means 'king' in the "Mitannian" letter of Tushratta; cf. e.g., *ib.*, col. 1. 84–85: ^{m}*Nimmoria-š*^{kur} *Mičirre-wa-ne-š* *iwri-š* 'Nimmuria, king of Egypt' (the transliteration is that of Bork, *Mitannisprache* p. 88). In the Kirkuk tablets the corresponding word is *irwi* as in *Irwi-šarri*, *HSS* V 58. 2. This connection was recognized by Gadd, cf. *Kirkuk* p. 77, n. ad 244. The transposition of sonorous sounds has already been noted in *ehli/elhi*. It is a common occurrence in the pronunciation of place-names by the modern Kurds; thus *Erbil* (Urbilum) becomes *(H)awlēr*, *Gul-ambar* is changed to *Ḫurmal*, etc.,

tilla,[91] the theophoric elements *Tešup*, *Hepa*,[92] and many others. This list could be enlarged very considerably. The meaning of many compounds is now understood quite well,[93] and we have as a result a fairly adequate conception of the principles which the Hurrians followed in the formation of their personal names.

As regards place names, the nominative suffix *-aš*, and the genitive/locative ending *-wa* have been already discussed. To this may now be added the plural termination *e-na* (already noted in place-names) and a singular suffix *-l* (see below).

---

cf. Speiser, *l. c.* 2, n. 7. The element *iwri* is also found in the Hurrian word *irwi-šši*, Chiera, *Inheritance texts* 89. 10, which corresponds to Akkadian *ilku* (so already Koschaker, *NRA* 15). In fact, I think that the Hurrian word enables us to determine the precise meaning of *ilku* in the Kirkuk tablets. Koschaker, *o.c.* 60, suggests the translation 'Lehenslast,' or feudal tasks, but this translation has recently been doubted by A. Schott, *OLZ* 1929: 854–5, who would translate the word by 'Dienstbarkeiten irgendwelcher Art.' Since *irwi* means 'king,' and the ending *-šši/e* has been established as the suffix of the passive participle (cf. Bork, *o.c.* 66) *irwišši/ilku* can mean nothing else than 'due to the king,' or the like, hence 'feudal tasks.'

[91] Also found in the name of the Elamite king *Hurba-tilla*. The word varies with *šarri*, and the meaning of both is evidently 'lord.' Hurba-tilla would thus mean 'Hurba (Kassite *Harbe*) is lord.'

[92] For possible connections of the goddess Hepa with Greek names cf. Burrows, JRAS 1925: 277 ff., and Kretschmer, Glotta XV (1925) 76 f.

[93] A list of Hurrian words gathered from the recently published material is given by Koschaker, *o.c.* 14 f. The following two statements of Koschaker (*ib*) require correction: *halzuhlu* certainly means 'official,' and not an object; the determinative *awēlu* is found frequently not only in Nuzian texts (cf. *JAOS* 49. 272, n. 8, published after the appearance of Koschaker's altogether admirable work), but already in the Amarna tablets, cf. Knudtzon, *Amarna* 30. 10; 67. 15. In fact, there are numerous other compounds with *-uhlu*, all designating some office; it is very likely that the element *ehli/elhi* discussed above is cognate with *uhlu*, the former representing the verb, and the latter the noun of the stem in question. The other correction concerns "šannirikla," which is listed erroneously as a Hurrian word. In reality, however, we have in the passage under discussion (Chiera, *Inheritance Texts* 29. 25–6) the phrase *a-na pa-ni ša* ^{d}*Ni-ri-ik-la* 'in the presence of Nergal.' The expression is equivalent to *ašar abulli ša* ^{d}*Nergal* 'at the Nergalgate;' for examples see Koschaker, *o.c.* 77, n. 1.

Having surveyed rapidly the most characteristic elements found in the Hurrian onomastic material, we may now touch briefly upon the problem of the earliest appearance of that people in Mesopotamia. It will be recalled, that the available evidence amply justifies the assumption that the Hurrians were to be found among the pre-Semitic inhabitants of Palestine, if they did not indeed constitute the main ethnic stock of Palestine and Syria prior to the appearance of the Semites.[94] As regards Lower Mesopotamia, it has been shown that the earliest traceable population of Sumer, and doubtless also of Akkad, belonged to the proto-Elamite family. The First Aeneolithic civilization was supplanted in the south-eastern end of the Two-River valley by the Sumerians, while in Akkad and in Elam we note simultaneously the appearance of another group that brought with it the so-called Second Aeneolithic culture. To my thinking, it is necessary to connect the Second civilization with the arrival of early Hurrians. For in the first place, the spread of that civilization corresponds very closely with the distribution of the Hurrians as ascertained from philological sources. This remarkable agreement of archaeological and linguistic data is particularly valuable, as we need no longer have recourse to the anomalous assumption that the Semites were the carriers of the second phase of the painted-pottery culture, which spread from Syria all the way to Elam.[95] On the other hand, there is also an appreciable amount of positive evidence, which leads to the assumption that Hurrians were to be found in Mesopotamia from very early times.

We have seen already that in the second millennium large portions of northern Mesopotamia were inhabited by the Hurrians. Similar conditions prevailed also a thousand years earlier. From documents that are contemporary with the Third Dynasty of Ur we learn, through the evidence of proper names, that Hurrians were to be found in that period in numerous districts east of the Tigris, such as Urbilum, Nawar, Urkish, Kakmi, and the like.[96] Arisen, king of Urkish and Nawar, belongs to the period of the Dynasty of Agade, and his lands are certainly to be sought north of Akkad, though a more precise identification is as yet impossible.[97] The presence in the neighborhood of Akkad of a typical Hurrian king, at the middle of the third millennium, is a clear indication of the early arrival of Hurrians in Mesopotamia.[98] But we can go still farther. If the evidence of the king-lists is to be trusted, as we have shown cause to believe, there were Hurrians in Akkad towards the end of the fourth millennium as well.

---

[94] Cf. especially Ungnad, *Kulturfragen* I 8, and Gustavs, *Ta'nnek* 13 ff.

[95] Frankfort, *Antiq. J.* VIII 217 ff.

When the king-lists assign to the early rulers of Kish, Uruk, or Awan, supernaturally long reigns, we need not necessarily consider those references as devoid of any historical information. What these fabulous dates imply is simply that the early Sumerians were entirely at a loss as regards those dynasties. The early historical rulers, like the kings of the First Dynasty of Ur, are credited with reigns of normal duration. Now the main reason for the confusion in connection with the two dynasties that preceded the first "kingship" at Ur, and with the one dynasty that followed it, is in the opinion of the present writer to be seen in the fact that the members of those dynasties were either entirely, or at least to a large extent, of non-Sumerian origin. This is certainly true of the Dynasty of Awan, which was Elamitic.[99] Awan brought to an end the first historical period of Sumer, and we need not wonder that the references to such an early political upheaval should be both confused and inexact, particularly since the Sumerians were than under a foreign domination. Even less was known to the Sumerian chroniclers concerning the period preceding the First Dynasty of Ur, beyond the fact that Kish-Uruk were older centers of royalty.[100] It is hardly likely that the Sumerians had much to do with those dynasties, for all that some of the kings bear Sumerian or Sumerianized names. The semi-mythical character of the period in question is not the main argument against Sumerian participation in it. As regards Kish, it must be borne in mind that the city lay in the center of Akkad, and not in Sumer. We cannot assume that the first Sumerians founded a kingdom in a territory that was well north of the principal Sumerian settlements known in historical times. Moreover, the proto-dynastic burials at Ur belong to a period that followed an unrelated and pre-Sumerian civilization.[101] The arrival of the Sumerians in Lower Mesopotamia cannot be placed more than a few centuries before the dynasty of Mesannipadda, and this interval is not long enough to account for the two previous dynasties. We need not, of course, assign to the latter the same reigns that the king-lists do; on the other hand, the dynasties of Kish-and Uruk must have been sufficiently powerful and long-established to be remembered many centuries later, after the political conditions had changed completely. And lastly, the archaeological remains of earliest Akkad cannot be attributed to the Sumerians, as was demonstrated in an earlier chapter.

---

[96] Landsberger, *ZA* XXXV 229.

[97] For the location of Nawar/Namri cf. Albright, *JAOS* 45. 215 f.

[98] Hence it is not necessary to burden the Gutians with the various functions that have been assigned to them by recent scholars.

[99] See above, ch. II.

In view of these facts, several names of the rulers of the

---

[100] On the other hand, the period of Gutian domination is near enough to the time of the chroniclers who composed the king-lists to be given an authentic historical setting.

[101] Cf. ch. III.

First Dynasty of Kish deserve more than passing attention, especially since they bear out the arguments just presented. The first few names cannot be used with much confidence because their real application is doubtful. They are Semitic, and they may possibly indicate that the Semites preceded the Sumerians in Akkad; such a conclusion would be by no means improbable, as we have already seen. However, it is far from certain whether the names in question refer to real persons. It has been observed that in *Galibum*, *Kalumum*, *Zukakip*, and *Arwium*, we really have names of animals (dog?, young lamb, scorpion, and gazelle), which in turn may be designations applied to stellar bodies.[102] It is quite possible, then, that in the early rulers of Kish we have merely a reflection of some astrological scheme applied to beginnings of history. In Etana we have one of the famous legendary figures of ancient Mesopotamia, which may be based upon an actual ruler, as was probably the case with Gilgamesh. The son of Etana, who is said to have succeeded him as king of Kish, is known by the name of *Balih* or *Walih*.[103] A later king of the same dynasty is given in the king-list as *Tupzah*.[104] The ending *-h* marks both names as Hurrian, and this identification can be amply corroborated. *Balih* is known as the name of a river, a tributary of the Euphrates in northern Mesopotamia; it is interesting that the same name is still in use, and that the mounds in the *Balīḥ* valley are covered with sherds of painted pottery belonging to the earliest civilizations of the Near East.[105] Moreover, the district in question was in the second millennium the very center of the vast Hurrian settlements. And to make this identification absolutely certain, an early chronicle published by King writes the name of this ruler of Kish with the same ideogram (AN.ILLAD)[106] with which the name of the Balih river is sometimes written ($^{\mathrm{ID}}$AN.ILLAD).[107]

---

[102] Cf. Dhorme, *RB* 1926: 70.

[103] Cf. Langdon, *OECT* II, pl. I, col. 2. 20, and Poebel, *HGT* 2. 1. 17.

[104] The name occurs in Langdon, l. c. 28. The editor calls attention to the fact that the sign is to be read *Dup* and not *Mes* (*l. c.*, p. 10, n. 19), but his copy does not make any distinction between the sign in question and those that he reads *Mes*. For this reason, Zimmern, Dhorme, and Smith prefer latter reading. It is quite true that the sign *Dup* would look in texts of the time of Third Dynasty of Ur very much like the one under discussion; in that case, however, the other passages would also have to be read with *Dup*, which is impossible. Perhaps Langdon noted a difference in the text, but failed to indicate it in the copy. As for the final sign, Langdon reads it *ah*, but Zimmern and Dhorme prefer *mug*. Smith, *EHA* 26, leaves it untransliterated. To be sure, the rading *mug* is not altogether satisfactory, though the *ah* of vs. 20 is also made differently. In view of these uncertainties the following remarks, which assume that the reading of Langdon is correct, must be considered as tentative; fortunately, the argument does not depend at all on the word in question. No doubt, a collation of the passage would help settle the problem once for all.

As regards *Tupzah*, the name is marked as Hurrian not only by the suffix, but also by the word elements which it contains. Thus *tup* is found in a great many compounds, such as *Tup-piia*, *Tup-ki-šenni*, *Tup-šiqqa*,[108] etc.; *za-h* is attested in *Gur-pa-zah*, *Tar-pa-zah*,[109] and probably also in the place-name *E-Kilam-zah*.[110] It is exceedingly improbable that names like *Balih* and *Tupzah* were invented by the early chroniclers; we must therefore consider their appearance in the list of rulers of the First Dynasty of Kish as proof of the presence of Hurrians in Akkad from earliest known times.

---

[105] Cf. Albright, *Man* XXVI no. 25.

[106] *Chronicles of Early Kings* II 143.

[107] Cf. Shalmaneser, *Obelisk* 54, (*nār*)*Ba-li-hi*, and *Monolith* 2. 79, ID.AN.-ILLA(D). Strangely enough, this obvious explanation of the writing in the King text (as ideographic) has not occurred to any scholar. Langdon is indeed very much surprised by the ideographic form, since he cites it with an exclamation mark after it, apparently considering it a mistake.

[108] See Gadd, *Kirkuk* p. 74.

[109] Cf. above, n. 65.

[110] Cf. Sennacherib, *Prism* 1. 70, where the name occurs in connection with such cities as Hardish-pi and Kubat-ti, whose endings are just as typical of Hurrian place-names as they are of the Zagros names. It is precisely because of the prevalence of the *za-h* termination in Hurrian territory that Langdon's reading of the last sign may be correct, especially in view of the fact that the preceding name *Balih* is certainly Hurrian.

The king who is said to have succeeded *Tupzah* bears the good Semitic name *Tizkar*; several of the kings that followed also have Semitic names.[111] It would appear, then, that together with the Hurrians, the Semites, too, belonged to the earliest population of Akkad, judging from the evidence of the king-lists. Since archaeological and philological considerations point, as we have seen, in the same direction, the testimony of the king-lists is also authenticated in this respect.[112] In the west, from where both the Hurrians and the Semites must have reached Akkad, the two ethnic groups lived evidently in close proximity, from very early times; they certainly did so in the second millennium, and the same conditions may now be assumed for Akkad, at a time that cannot be later than the end of the fourth millennium.

To sum up the results thus obtained from the entire material hitherto discussed, the following ethnic conditions appear to have prevailed in Lower Mesopotamia from the beginning. The earliest population was proto-Elamitic; to this group belong the remains of the First Aeneolithic civilization, as well as the earliest place-names, beginning with the "pre-diluvian" period. Just as the Hurrians, who brought with them the Second Aeneolithic civilization, appear from the west, the Sumerians reach the head of the Persian Gulf. In the meantime Semites had also arrived, possibly in the wake of the

---

[111] So, doubtless, Ilkum and Iltasadum, cf. *OECT* II 2. 30–33.

[112] Dhorme calls attention to the fact that *En-me-(ir)-kar*, who according to the king-list built Uruk and became the second king of its First Dynasty (his father *Mes-kinga-šer* having ruled at E-anna) had dealings with the Amorites, according to a recently published mythological text (cf. *RB* 1926: 73 f. see also Albright, *JAOS* 49. 207). The text in question is W.-B. 162, published by Langdon in *OECT* I pls. 5–9, with transliteration and translation. The text contains a prayer (in Sumerian) of Enmerkar of Erech, in which Ishtar (Innini) is entreated that "from all of Sumer and Akkad the rebellious Amorite be

Hurrian invasion.[112a] For a time the Sumerians remain confined to Sumer proper, while the Hurrians and the Semites concentrate in Akkad. About the turn of the fourth millennium the Sumerians extend their influence to Akkad as well, only to be stopped by the increase of Semitic power, following the rise of the Dynasty of Agade.

To return to the interrelations between Hurrians and Semites, we cannot very well pursue this intensely fascinating subject as far as we should like to, for lack of relevant sources. Perhaps future excavations in Syria will furnish the necessary material. The entire problem of the Western Semites is doubtless to be viewed in the light of the interrelations between Semites and Hurrians, which must have commenced in Amurru at the time that the Semites first appeared

---

expelled," cf. col. 2. 12–13. Whatever the historical value of this allusion may be, it is interesting to note that tradition placed the conflict with the Amorites, or in other words the invasion of Sumer and Akkad by the Amorites, in the semi-legendary period of the First Dynasty of Uruk.

[112a] Whatever one may think of the position which Bauer and Landsberger have taken towards the "Amorite" question, it is not advisable to ignore the well-founded conclusion of Bauer (*Ostkanaanäer* 89–90) that there existed east of the Tigris a west-Semitic center before the First Dynasty of Babylon came into power; it may have been from those regions that many of the "Amorites" arrived in Southern Mesopotamia. The whole problem cannot be discussed here in detail, but the presence of westerners in the Zagros districts is not as inexplicable as it may appear at first. The northern route from the Mediterranean to Elam and further east was older, more convenient, and certainly more dependable in the winter season, than the route that followed the rivers (cf. the Persian road from "Sardis to Susa." We have seen that the carriers of the Second Aeneolithic civilization came to Elam by way of the northern and submontane districts rather than through Sumer. It is altogether likely that the western Semites used the caravan roads in the territory east of the Tigris at least as frequently as the southern route, if not more so. At the same time, it must not be forgotten that it was easier to gain access to the hill-country in Eastern Zagros than to the better organized Akkadian lands. The early appearance of Amorites in Kazallu and neighboring districts need not be, therefore, looked upon as an insoluble mystery. Kudur-Mabuk may have been guided by wise political considerations when he welcomed the foreign settlers and

on the Syrian coast.[113] What went on then we can only guess from the analogy of later periods. One thing, however,

---

assumed the title of their "father," or protector. But after gaining a foothold in the old culture lands of the south, he had no hesitancy in turning against the foreigners in Kazallu, something which he would hardly have done if the region had been purely Elamitic.

[113] The evidence of ancient place-names from the Syrian coast is still to be adduced as proof of the Hurrian occupation of that section from very early times. From a recently published text (*URI* 275. 1. 5–10) we learn that Naram-Sin was the first one to sack the western centers Arman and Ibla. According to the second column of that inscription, these conquests took the king from the Euphrates up to the city of Ulisu. Now S. Smith, who edited the text in question, considers it probable that the pronunciation of Arman resembled that of the Lullu city, whose name could be written as we have seen Arman, Ialman, or Halman. If the latter be admitted as a variant pronunciation of the western Arman, it would obviously represent the earliest name of Aleppo (*Halpa* of the Hittite texts). I believe that Smith's theory is correct. If so, the name must belong to a language related to that of the Lullu, as the correspondence of both the form as well as peculiarities of pronunciation could not be accidental. As a matter of fact many other place-names of the same district can be assigned with some confidence to the Hurrian-Zagros groups. The above-mentioned Ulisu (later Ullaza, cf. Smith, *l. c.* p. 80) has a sibilant suffix of the type which was noticed in the districts of Arrapha and the Lullu. The city of Damascus, ancient *Timaš-gi*, *Dumaš-qa*, etc. is obviously non-Semitic. Its suffix points again to the east, where we have the city of *Mat-qa*, near Kimash, and Mount *Bidir-gi* in Zamua. *Saniru*, (Hermon) the mountain of Damascus, (III Rawlinson 5.6) is distinctly of the same provenance. Thus two of the most important Syrian cities of today may be traced back with a great deal of probability to the non-Semitic inhabitants of the land. The tablets from *Tuni-p* (note the suffix) and Qaṭna are full of Hurrian elements; it is quite true that their date is comparatively late, but on the other hand, place-names (cf. *Zinzar*, *Tunanat Nuhašše*, *Ube*, see index in Knudtzon, *Amarna*) usually go back to remote times. This is not the place to discuss the subject at greater detail. It is clear, however, that so many parallel formations cannot be due to coincidence. We need not assume, of course, that the Lullu were the pre-Semitic substratum in Syria (even though a *šakkanakku* by the name *Lullu* is mentioned in the recently discovered tablets from Qaṭna, cf. Syria IX (1928) 95). But that a people related to the Lullu formed that substratum is now exceedingly probable, especially in view of the corroborative archaeological evidence. It may be stated with sufficient confidence, that the people in question were Hurrians, who were related to the Lullu, as we have had occasion to see. Cf. also note 129 at the end of this chapter.

stands out very prominently. These immemorial contacts of the two unrelated groups resulted in a marked modification of the so-called Semitic type, as represented by the Assyrians and by the Jews. The sculptural representations of the former reveal features that are usually associated with the Anatolians, or "Armenoids." In other words, the ancient Assyrian was far from being a typical "Semite" in the same sense that the Arab is assumed to be. Racially, the Assyrians were strongly influenced by non-Semitic strains, derived from the older populations of the districts in which the "Assyrian" type was moulded. The same is true of the Aramaeans as exemplified by the bulk of the Syrians of today; the so-called "Jewish" type is another example of a composite racial origin. In all these instances we have the same interesting results: a people of Semitic speech is superimposed upon a group of an entirely different origin; the product of the resultant intermixture retains the Semitic language, but the physical characteristics are largely those of the original inhabitants. The dialectal differences of Assyrian, Aramaic, and Hebrew, are doubtless due to a multiplicity of causes, of which only a few may be discerned at present. Thus the dialect of Assyria was bound to be strongly affected by the Semitic speech of Akkad, especially since the script was borrowed from the south. As for Akkadian itself, many centuries of contact with the totally heterogeneous Sumerians (and Zagros peoples) led to very pronounced modifications of the dialect. On the other hand, the Semitic dialects of Palestine were less exposed to such radical influences, and the phonology of Canaanite remains relatively uncontaminated. The wandering Aramaeans occupied an intermediate position, which is again reflected in their speech. These are but a few general aspects of a problem that is extraordinarily complicated and necessarily quite obscure.

In the case of the Assyrians, the immediate question is where that particular type originated. The difficulties that are inherent in this problem are clearly realized by Sidney Smith, who presents the subject in an admirable chapter of his *Early History of Assyria*, entitled "The origin of the Assyrians."[114] Smith's conclusion is that the development of the Assyrian type took place in the middle Euphrates area, in the valleys of the Balih and the Habur. In this he is probably right to a pronounced degree.[115] When he doubts, however, that the Hurrians were an important element in that composition, he appears to have gone too far in his line of reasoning. Precisely that area was one of the principal centers of the Hurrians in the second millennium, and there is no reason whatever to doubt that similar conditions had obtained two thousand years earlier. That eastern Anatolian elements, such as the proto-Hittites for instance, were not unknown in the same area can hardly be denied. In fact, it becomes increasingly probable that the large section of Hither Asia, which includes Palestine, Syria, and eastern Anatolia, was occupied from the beginning by the two subdivisions of the "Asiatic" or "Japhetic" group, viz., the Hurrians and the proto-Hittites. In historic times, the former are found more to the east, and we may assume therefore that the same people were always more prominent in Amurru and in northern Mesopotamia than the proto-Hittites. The evidence of philology favors strongly such an assumption, as we have seen.[116] For these reasons it is primarily to the Hurrians that we must look for the sources of non-Semitic influences that are reflected in the physical characteristics of the Assyrians and the so-called Western Semites.

---

[114] *O.c.*, ch. VIII.

[115] Smith did not make it sufficiently clear that the district in question was only a secondary center of the Assyrians, that is to say, a region where Semites lived for a long time together with the older population, by whose physical characteristics they were considerably affected. Hence the criticism of Smith's views on the subject by Dhorme, *RB* 1929: 436–7. That the Assyrians retained their Semitic speech, and that they were culturally influenced by Akkad and by Sumer, no serious student of the subject could very well deny.

[116] See above, n. 113.

Before this chapter is concluded it will be necessary to give our attention once more to Palestine. It is well known that, culturally, Assyria depended largely upon Sumer and Akkad. This fact is borne out most clearly by the religious and cosmological beliefs of the Assyrians. There are also notable departures from South Mesopotamian standards, as is e.g., the case with the Assyrian calendar,[117] and as may also be gathered from a comparison of the Assyrian laws with those of Babylonia. The legal canons of Assyria show a degree of sternness and severity that was unknown in Babylonia,[118] and the cruelty of the Assyrian rulers was to become proverbial. Now this evident lack of humanitarian tendencies in the official life of Assyria has been often attributed to the non-Semitic strain in Ashur, and this view may very well be the correct one. At all events, dependent though Ashur was upon Akkad, there are numerous features of Assyrian life that cannot be paralleled in the south.

As regards Palestine, the cultural dependence of that country upon Babylonia is quite naturally much slighter than in the case of Assyria. Yet there are here, too, unmistakable contacts with Akkadian culture. Perhaps the most interesting similarity is to be noticed in the treatment of the prediluvian heroes as found both in the Bible and in the cuneiform literature. In both sources the number is ten, the last of whom is destined to preserve the human race from complete extinction following the Flood. These correspondences are sufficiently close to preclude the possibility of independent origin, and the assumption of a common source for the traditions in question appears inevitable. But at the same time there are also marked differences in the Biblical and cuneiform traditions which cannot be explained without the aid of a third factor that served as an intermediary. In the first place, the cuneiform sources speak of prediluvian kings, whereas the Bible deals with patriarchs. Here the divergence is doubtless due to the peculiar importance which the Sumerians attached to "kingship," while a Semitic version would naturally reflect a patriarchal organization of society. On the other hand, the difference in names cannot be explained away so easily. The kings who ruled before the Flood have not a single name in common with the prediluvian patriarchs, and no amount of textual or etymological manipulations will suffice to derive the Biblical names from their alleged cuneiform prototypes. Besides, we know at present that the Babylonian names were little different in 250 B.C. from what they had been two thousand years earlier, even if transcribed in alphabetic characters and provided with terminations from another language. Among the excerpts from the Greek work of Berossus, there are passages concerning the prediluvian period as viewed by the ancient Babylonians.[119] In these fragments the names of the ten kings have been fortunately preserved. Now a comparison of the Greek forms with the corresponding characters of the recently published king-lists reveals the interesting fact that the names of Berossus were derived from the same cuneiform sources from which we of today have obtained our own knowledge of Sumero-Akkadian cosmogonies.[120] In other words, Babylonian traditions remained much the same throughout the entire Biblical period. If the names of the patriarchs who preceded Noah had been due to Babylonian sources, they would have been preserved with at least the same degree of accuracy as in the Greek accounts that date from the post-Biblical period. Since this is not so, we cannot avoid the conclusion that the Biblical version of prediluvian conditions was not based directly upon the Babylonian account. There was evidently somewhere a secondary source, which transmitted the Mesopotamian material to the Hebrews in a very modified form.

---

[117] Cf. Landsberger, *Der kultische Kalender*, and Smith, *o.c.* 114 f.

[118] Cf. Kohler and Ungnad, *Assyrische Rechtsurkunden* (Leipzig, 1913) 466.

---

[119] Cf. Schnabel, *Berossos*.

[120] See especially, Zimmern, *ZDMG* LXXVIII (1924) 19 ff.

The objection may be raised that it is not necessary at all to assume a Mesopotamian origin for the traditions in question for the very reason that the differences are so pronounced; both the Bible and the cuneiform records may have been based on originally Semitic material.[121] Logical as such a view may be, it cannot be adopted without substituting one set of difficulties for another. The traditions regarding the period before the Flood are already well established in the early Sumerian period. We should be, consequently, compelled to assume that the Sumerians borrowed the principal idea from the Semites, changing only the names. This process would have been consummated in prehistoric times. In view of the fact that it is the Semites who are culturally dependent upon the Sumerians far into the third millennium, it is scarcely probable that a thousand years earlier the conditions were reversed. Furthermore, some of the Biblical names of the prediluvian patriarchs are no more obviously West Semitic, than they are Sumerian. An alternative hypothesis might suggest that both Semites and Sumerians borrowed in this instance from a third source. Such traditions as those about Gilgamesh are, found, indeed, throughout the ancient Near East, and there existed Hurrian and Hittite versions of the great epic by the side of the Sumerian and Akkadian recensions.[122] But all these speculations are out of place for the time being. The most reasonable view still is that the ultimate origin of the mythological accounts under discussion is to be sought in Mesopotamia, and that variations in the non-Mesopotamian versions are due to local modifications.

---

[121] This is the main argument of Clay, *A Hebrew Deluge Story in the Cuneiform* (New Haven, 1922).

It would follow that the Hebrews had their own recension of prehistoric events, which was only indirectly related to the Sumero-Akkadian sources. The next question is, Through what channels did the Babylonian traditions travel to the west?

It has been previously indicated that there existed a Hurrian version of the Gilgamesh Epic. Unfortunately, all that is now extant of that recension is a very small fragment. The identification, however, is certain in view of the names ^{AN}*Galgamišul* and ^{AN}*Huwawa*, which obviously represent Gilgamesh and Hubaba. A third character in the Hurrian fragment is called ^{AN}*Na-ah-ma-ú?-li-el*, which is most likely to be read *Nahmaulel*. The name has the same determinative for 'god' (AN) that is attached in this version to the names of Gilgamesh and Hubaba; the final *-l* is a nominal singular suffix as in *Galgamiš-ul*. The entire fragment was first analyzed and translated by Ungnad.[123]

Father E. Burrows has lately pointed out that Nahmaulel seems to take in the Hurrian text the place of the Sumerian Flood hero Ziusudra.[124] He has also suggested that the Hurrian name should be connected with the Biblical hero of the Flood, Noah, whose name corresponds to the first part of Nahmaulel. To this might be added that the Biblical etymology of the name *Noah*, as given in Gen. 5.29, lends support to that suggestion; for '(God) will comfort me' may be quite easily obtained out of *Nahmaulel* by analyzing the word as a compound of נחם 'he comforted' and אל 'God.' Of course, this would be merely a popular etymology, but that is precisely what Biblical etymologies usually are. Whether the name Nahmaulel is originally Hurrian or not, the final *-l* is here clearly a suffix, and it can have little to do with Hebrew *'ēl*.

---

[122] The Hittite material relating to the Gilgamesh epic is now available in the edition of Friedrich, *ZA* XXXIX (1929) 1–82. It may be added that the name Gilgamesh is very close to the city-name Gargamish (in northern Syria), and that Humbaba/Huwawa is admittedly non-Sumerian. Even though Huwawa be distinct from the western Kubaba (cf. Albright, "The Anatolian Goddess Kubaba," *AfO* V 229–231) it may be of western origin, and not necessarily Elamite (according to Ungnad, *ZA* XXXV 138, Huwawa is definitely Hurrian). But the subject leaves too much to speculation, and space forbids going into further details.

[123] *ZA* XXXV (1924) 133–140.

[124] Cf. his "Notes on Ḫarrian," *JRAS* 1925, 277 ff. *Ziusudra* is of course identical with later *Xisouthros*.

Under the present circumstances, the above argument must not be pressed too far. But it cannot be denied that it has much in its favor. In מהללאל or מחויאל, as well as in מתושאל we again find the ending *-l*. מתושלח, which interchanges with מתושאל, also lacks an absolutely satisfactory Semitic etymology, particularly in view of the above variation. And how are we to explain קינן or קין, חנוך and למך, עירד and ירד? To make out all these names as Hurrian is unwarranted at present.[124a] But it may be perfectly justifiable to say that the old Hebrews got the names in question through Hurrian channels, if the arguments that have just been cited are taken into consideration. To be sure, the whole matter is still exceedingly uncertain, beyond the fact that the Biblical names under discussion are definitely non-Babylonian and, with a few possible exceptions, also non-Hebraic.

We know that the Hebrews were in close contact with the Hurrians in more than one district. In Palestine the Hurrians certainly preceded the Israelites. As regards the middle Euphrates area, to which Biblical tradition points as the home of Abraham's kinsmen,[125] that district was the very center of the Hurrian territories. Whatever the original meaning of the term *Habiru* may have been, it can hardly be doubted that among the *Habiru* there were elements that became later known as Hebrew.[126] Now the *Habiru* have relations with the Hurrians even as far east as Arrapha. It was inevitable, then, that the Hebrews should have shared many cultural features with the Hurrians. The Kirkuk tablets contain indications of some very striking parallels between Hurrian and Biblical customs.[127] And lastly, the physical characteristics of the Hebrews, as exemplified by the Jews, were admittedly influenced to a very pronounced degree by the Hurrians.[128] These disconnected facts do not yield as yet a connected and distinct picture. They do shed, however, an appreciable amount of light upon an intensely fascinating set of conditions.[129]

[124a] The names have become Semitized in some instances (חנוך, מתושאל).

[125] The literature on the subject is growing constantly. I shall cite only the following: Burney, *The Book of Judges* (London, 1918) pp. LV–CXVIII;

Olmstead, *History of Assyria* (New York, 1926); Dhorme, "Les Amorrhéens," *RB* 1928: 63–79, 161–180; *id.*, "Abraham dans le cadre de l'histoire," *ib.* 367–385, 481–511.

[126] For recent discussions on the subject of the Habiru see A. Jirku, *Die Wanderungen der Hebräer im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, *AO* 24. 2 (1924); J. Lewy, "Ḫabiru und Hebräer," *OLZ* 1927: 738–746, 825–833; Landsberger, "*Ḫ*abiru und Lulaḫḫu," *KF* I (1929) 321–333.

[127] This subject must be reserved for a special study in order to give it the attention which it merits. In the meantime I would call attention to one very remarkable text from Arrapha, published by Gadd, *Kirkuk* 51. It furnishes a most interesting commentary to Genesis 31, as noted by Gadd and S. Smith. The cuneiform document makes it clear that a son-in-law was considered the legitimate heir to the estate of his wife's father, if he was in possession of the latter's housegods. This fact puts Rachel's theft of her father's *teraphim* in an entirely new light. For her act made Jacob the heir to Laban's property, hence the anxiety to recover the images. Since Harran, the home of Abraham's kinsmen, was one of the important Hurrian centers, it is perfectly natural that Hurrian laws and customs should be reflected in the stories concerning the patriarchs. The Nuzi texts contain many other illuminating parallels to the Bible.

[128] The oft-cited statement of Ezekiel, addressed to Jerusalem, *viz.*, "The Amorite was thy father and thy mother a Hittite" (16.3), can be now fully appreciated.

[129] This note is in the nature of an appendix to note 113. The following remarks were suggested by publications that appeared after the MS had gone to press, and the unusual length of note 113 has rendered it necessary to make the present additions in a less crowded section of this chapter.

As regards the possible connections of Syria with the Lullu, it is very noteworthy that the tablets from Qaṭna mention quite prominently the land of Tukrish. It was shown above that Lullu and Tukrish were evidently close neighbors (ch. IV, note 36). Now Tukrish is cited by name in those Syrian texts that allow us also to infer the presence of Lullu elements in the same district. A mere coincidence would scarcely explain these truly remarkable parallels.

New, and in some respects entirely unsuspected, information has been very recently brought to light in Ras Shamra, about 8 miles north of Latakia. An expedition headed by Professor F. A. Schaeffer has unearthed there a number of cuneiform tablets, two of which are in Akkadian and the remainder in a hitherto undeciphered writing cf. Schaeffer, "Les fouilles de Minet-el-Beida et de Ras Shamra," *Syria* X 285–302. The texts have been edited by Virolleaud in an article on "Les inscriptions cunéiformes de Ras Shamra," *Syria* X 302 ff., with plates. One of the Akkadian tablets (*ib.* pl. LXXVI 1. 1) contains the name *Aki-hinni*, which is typically Hurrian, as Virolleaud has recognized. Thus we have further evidence for the spread of Hurrian elements, this time embracing the northernmost section of Syria. As regards the undeciphered tablets, the script appears to be alphabetic (*l. c.*). It is needless to speculate at present on the possible character of the language whose speakers were able to simplify the cuneiform writing as early as the Amarna period. But the fact that Ras Shamra lies so near to Anatolia, and incidentally also to Cyprus, makes it not improbable that the language in question was Japhetic in character.

CHAPTER VI

OTHER CONTACTS—CONCLUSION

THE survey of the immediate neighbors of Babylonia and Assyria has thus been brought to an end. The investigation concerned primarily the non-Semitic and non-Sumerian ethnic elements whose influence was felt in Mesopotamia from the earliest known times. The peoples of the Zagros, among whom the Elamites, the Lullu, the Gutians, and the Kassites, were most prominent, have been found to constitute an eastern group, while the Hurrians formed the western division of the peoples under discussion. The philological material available for study was not sufficient for a final solution of the problem as regards the genetic relationship of the two groups. But scattered indications of linguistic interpendence in both sections are so numerous, and the connecting links are so closely interwoven, that an ultimate relation between the Hurrian and Elamitic families may be regarded as reasonably certain. This cumulative evidence is corroborated to a large extent by the results of archaeological research. Numerous historical and geographical considerations favor the same assumption. The probability that both the Hurrian and Elamite languages have left structural survivals among the modern Caucasian group may be used, with due caution, as a further supporting argument. And lastly, there is the somatic evidence of racial similarity between the modern representatives of the two stocks in question.

The thread that was first picked up in Elam has thus led us, through many paths and bypaths, to the gates of Anatolia. The problem of ethnic relations between the groups which we have been studying and the peoples of Anatolia is, strictly speaking, not within our province. Nor can the question be settled at present with any approximation to certainty. I shall only take up a few paragraphs in order to indicate the general status of the subject.[1]

Before the arrival of the *centum*-Indo-Europeans, who gave the Hittite language its Indo-European character, large portions of Anatolia were inhabited by a people whose place-names contained the formatives *-nd-*, and *-ss-*.[2] According to the evidence of the archives from Boghazkoi, the pre-Hittite population of eastern Anatolia consisted largely of the Hatti, or proto-Hittites.[3] And finally, the non-Semitic personal names in the Cappadocian tablets[4] furnish material for a linguistic study of the ancient inhabitants of the district of Caesarea, in eastern Anatolia. Now it is probable, though not absolutely certain, that the place-names with *-nd-* and *-ss-*, the fragments of the proto-Hittite records from Boghazkoi, and the native personal names from the Cappadocian tablets, all belong to the same ethnic group, viz., the proto-Hittites. From the sundry fragments of connected texts in proto-Hittite, Forrer has concluded that the language was essentially prefixal, since suffixes did not seem to play any part in its morphology. Bleichsteiner has tried to find parallels for proto-Hittite in the north-western group of the Caucasian languages.[5] As for the onomastic material, the most characteristic feature of the non-Semitic names found in the Cappadocian tablets is the repetition or iteration of elements in the same name. These are, briefly, the few meager indications for the character of the pre-Hittite language or languages of eastern Anatolia, which might be considered for comparative purposes.

---

[1] For a broader outline of the subject the reader may be referred to the inductory chapter of the present study.

[2] For references cf *ib.*, notes 9 and 37.

[3] *Ib.*, n. 16.

[4] Cf. Landsberger, *ZA* XXXV (1924) 221–2, and especially F. J. Stephens, *Personal Names from Cuneiform Inscriptions of Cappadocia*, *YOR* XIII-1, (New Haven, 1928).

[5] Cf. his articles on "Kaukasische Sprachen," *RV* VI 260–263.

Now there is no typically prefixal language among the dialects which we have hitherto discussed. To be sure, there are no continuous texts extant in Guti, Lullubian, or Kassite.[6] Any one of these dialects may conceivably, though not probably, have employed prefixes to a notable degree. At all events, we are bound to operate in this case with too many unknown quantities, and the resultant arguments could not be considered as conclusive, or even convincing. The following few details, however, are sufficiently interesting to deserve mention.

It has been indicated in a preceding chapter that Kassite (as well as Elamite), and proto-Hittite, appear to have had several significant words in common.[7] The stops are treated in proto-Hittite in precisely the same way as in the Hurrian and Zagros dialects. The same applies to the interchanges of liquids and nasals. The phonetic equipment of proto-Hittite included also the peculiar *tl*-sound. And lastly, Hurrian proper names, personal as well as geographical, employ frequently the elements -*šš*-[8] and -*zz*-, while -*nd*- is even found in Lullu territory;[9] now, all these onomastic elements are particularly characteristic of Anatolia. The alleged relationship between proto-Hittite and north-west Caucasian is not without interest in this connection,[10] and the racial evidence of the "Anatolian" type is not totally dissimilar from that of the Hurrian group. All these scattered indications cannot be entirely ignored. It is not by any means out of the question that there existed in proto-historic times some degree of relationship between proto-Hittite and its eastern neighbors; but the whole matter is necessarily doubtful. The appearance of the First Aeneolithic civilization in Elam marks the end of the pro-ethnic period of Japhethite or Caucasian. Consequently, by the end of the third millennium, when we first encounter traces of Anatolian languages, the various branches of the original Japhetic family must have had about two thousand years of independent development. Moreover, Anatolia was apparently from very early times the meeting place of several heterogeneous groups. The arrival of the proto-Indo-Europeans in Asia Minor is now assumed to have taken place rather early in the third millennium. Hittite is the most instructive example of what is likely to happen to a language that is the product of more than one ethnic group. Proto-Hittite may have fared similarly in an area where "Caucasians," Semites, and Indo-Europeans were all present in very remote times. Suspended judgment is, therefore, the best policy under these circumstances.

---

[6] Unless, of course, we consider as such the personal names that consist of brief sentences.

[7] See ch. V notes 9–11. Incidentally, iteration to not uncommon in the Elamitic group.

[8] In reality, pronounced -*ss*-.

[9] Cf. ch. IV note 21. This wide diffusion of the -*nt* suffix makes me somewhat sceptical of the view of Kretschmer (*Glotta* XIV 84–106) that the element in question may be in all instances of proto-Indo-European origin. It would be of great value to determine to what extent did the dissimilation of a long or a double dental contribute to the appearance of forms containing *nt* or *nd*, and conversely, to establish where the latter groups of sounds resulted in a double, or even simplified dental. Cf. e.g., the spellings *Purušhanda*, *Purusušhatim*, etc.

With the ancient inhabitants of Armenia,[11] and of the adjoining districts to the east, we are on much safer ground. But the available material is of late date, belonging in its entirety to the first millennium B.C.[12] It has little bearing on our main subject, except perhaps as potential evidence for the continuity of the elements which we have studied. The pre-Indo-European language of Armenia was Haldian or Vannic; it is known to us from a number of royal inscriptions, some of which are bilinguals. The relation of Haldian to modern Armenian is approximately the same as that of proto-Hittite to the main language of the Hittite empire. That is to say, numerous Haldian linguistic elements have been incorporated in Armenian, which belongs to the *satem*-branch of the Indo-European family. The study of Haldian has been keenly pursued by a considerable number of scholars, and it is safe to say that one of the main inducements has been actually the possible bearing of that language upon modern Armenian.[13] The characteristic physical type of a large number of the Armenians was evidently taken over from the Haldians.

---

[10] Cf. n. 5.

[11] See the work of Lehman-Haupt, *Armenien einst und jetzt*, I and II (1910–1926).

[12] Except for a small number of place-names recorded in the annals of the Middle-Assyrian kings, in connection with their campaigns against Urarṭu.

Philologically, Haldian is most clearly related to Hurrian, which is a much older language. Ungnad is in doubt only as to whether we should consider Haldian as a descendant of Hurrian, or merely as a sister language.[14] This view takes perhaps too much for granted, but the close relationship of the two linguistic units under discussion can hardly be denied. Just as in Hurrian, we have in Haldian a singular subject suffix *-s* (*-š*), and a similar plural suffix (*i*)*na*. The god Teshup is shared by both groups, in common with eastern Anatolia. According to an admirable recent study of Tseretheli, the Haldian verb employs *u* as the element which is indicative of the first person singular, while *a* has the same function in the third person.[15] I would call attention to the fact that this is precisely the case in Hurrian, where e.g., *tan-ol-u* means 'I give (repeatedly),' and *tan-ol-a* is the corresponding third person.[16] In Elamite *u* signifies, quite similarly, the first person singular, both as a possessive element and as a personal pronoun ('I' and 'mine').[17]

---

[13] For the literature on the subject cf. Tseretheli, *Die neuen ḫaldischen Inschriften*, 1, to which may be added A. Götze, "Zur Kelischin Stele," *ZA* XXXIX (1929) 99–128.

[14] *Kulturfragen* I 7.

[15] *O.c.*, pp. 64–7.

Finally, the place-names and the personal names of the northern and north-eastern provinces of the late Assyrian empire show numerous formations which have previously been noted in Hurrian and in the Zagros dialects.[18] The conclusion is inevitable that near relatives of Elamites, Gutians, Lullubians, etc., were to be found originally all the way to the Caspian Sea. However, the relevant material belongs primarily, as has been indicated, to the first millennium B.C., or in other words, to a period when the number of Iranian elements is steadily on the increase. It is not always a simple task to separate in the cuneiform sources the Iranian onomastic material from the other non-Semitic designations.[19] Moreover, we can scarcely expect from such late records information of decisive import as regards our main problem. For it is in the ethnic and cultural origins that we have been principally interested; but on reaching the first millennium before our era we have left the earliest civilizations of the Near East very far behind. In point of time, the rise of the Persian empire, to give a single illustration, is nearer to the present age than to the First City of Susa. Our case, then, must presently be rested; we shall rely on what testimony we have been able to obtain from the long array of witnesses hitherto examined.

* * *

---

[16] Bork, *Mitannisprache* 48.

[17] *Id.*, *JRAS* 1928, 68.

[18] Cf. especially Thureau-Dangin, *Sargon.*

[19] The first attempt at a scientific treatment of the subject was made by Eduard Meyer in his article on "Die ältesten datierten Zeugnisse der iranischen Sprache und der zoroastrischen Religion," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* XLII (1909) 1–27. Since then much new material has come to light, which is, however, "Indic" rather than Iranian.

In concluding, it remains to recapitulate the most salient facts which the present inquiry has established, in order to realize what bearing they may have upon our approach to the problems of the ancient East. In the first place, it has been shown that the entire highland zone between Anatolia and Elam was in the aeneolithic period under the influence of two related civilizations ,which are represented in Elam by the First and Second Cultures of Susa. The plains to the south of that highland zone, which constitute the so-called Fertile Crescent, belong at the start to the same cultural spheres. Corresponding to the distribution of the two aeneolithic civilizations, of which the first is deeply rooted in the eastern section of the zone in question, while the second is specialized in the west, we have the spread of two related ethnic branches. The eastern group may be identified with the Elamites and their congeners, and the Hurrians constitute the western portion. The evidence for these ethnic deductions is primarily philological, and especially onomatological; when linked with the archaeological data the two types of sources become mutually corroborative to a very marked extent.

The constituent elements of those two interrelated groups formed the oldest population of Hither Asia, as far as we can trace it at present. Their material remains are stratigraphically earlier than those of any other cultural group. The place-names that may be safely assigned to them are, similarly, the oldest known in the entire area. It is very probable, therefore, that we are dealing here with the population that was indigenous to the highland zones of the Near East.

We know that those highlanders were neither Semitic nor Sumerian; it is equally certain that they were not related to the Indo-European speaking peoples. All of these were clearly later arrivals. The later historical civilizations of Mesopotamia, Syria, and eastern Anatolia, are thus products of the fusion of native elements with those that were superimposed upon them. Ethnically, the highlanders, whom we may now call ancient Japhethites, formed the foundation upon which the invading races were able to build. Culturally, the invaders owed a great deal, no doubt, to the original population; we have seen how highly developed were metallurgy and the potter's crafts in the two aeneolithic civilizations. And lastly, the languages of the oldest inhabitants of Hither Asia left their mark upon the various forms of speech that were brought in at later periods. This is particularly true of eastern Anatolia and Armenia. In Mesopotamia this influence is much less in evidence, though a certain degree of it may be safely assumed, especially with regard to phonology.[20] The toponymic material of the ancient Elamites and Hurrians has survived in many instances unto our own times.

In the introductory chapter of this study a general review was given of the problems arising from the investigation of the so-called "third ethnic element" in ancient Eurasia; that element consisted of peoples which could not be linked genetically with the Hamito-Semitic and the Indo-European families. It was shown how some scholars spoke with confidence of a uniform "Caucasian" group that is alleged to have spread in ancient times over the wide area extending from Spain to Persia. In connection with these bold claims an outline was given of the methodological fallacies from which these theories suffered. At the conclusion of the present inquiry we must still distinguish clearly three separate constituents of the Japhetic group: the Aegean-Anatolian elements are not to be confused with the Hurrian-Elamite branches, while the speakers of the modern Caucasian languages form a third division. All that can be said at present is that the Mesopotamian and Zagros Japhethites were interrelated, and that they may have survived to some extent among the modern "Caucasians." The same applies largely to the Aegeans and their neighbors. The Hurrians may possibly have been the connecting link between the Elamite and the Aegean worlds, and scattered indications that have been forthcoming from Anatolia make it appear probable that some ultimate connection between the European and the Asiastic Japhethites is likely to be established in the near future. In the meantime we must guard against confusing probability with certainty. Further study of the modern Caucasian languages may contribute material of importance for the solution of the Japhethite problem. When it will have been definitely established that those languages are all derived from a common source, Caucasian philology will be in a position to cast the deciding vote. But it is hardly necessary for the present to anticipate so much. Each section of the highland zone has its own contribution to make. The conclusions to which this study has led us are of appreciable consequence for the better understanding of the earliest history of Mesopotamia; in fact, they help to clarify the difficult problem of Mesopotamian origins. And since the first civilizations of Mesopotamia and of Elam are not antedated by any other well-established civilization, the earliest history of Hither Asia is, in a certain sense, also the beginning of history in the Ancient World.

---

[20] Most instructive in this respect is a comparison of the Semitic inscriptions of the Dynasty of Agade with the documents of the period of Hammurabi. The latter are generally as precise with regard to spelling as the cuneiform characters permit. But the writing of the Sargonide inscriptions is as barbarous from the point of view of phonetics as it is often astonishingly fine as regards the external appearance of the signs. To be sure, it must have been difficult at the start to write a Semitic dialect with characters designed for a different language. But this explanation would apply only to the very first documents written in Akkadian. There can be little doubt that early Akkadian had a markedly un-Semitic phonology, which was corrected in part by the arrival of large numbers of Western Semites. Now the early decadence of Semitic speech-sounds in Akkad can be due in part only to the Sumerians. The pre-Sumerian population of the country had undoubtedly much to do with this particular case; in fact, it has been shown that Sumerian phonology, too, was affected by the same influences, cf. ch. II, notes 77 ff.

Let us see now how the appearance of other races affected the ethnic conditions of the most ancient Near East. The basic stock of the area which extends from eastern Anatolia to Elam, and also of the adjoining plains to the south, consisted of the people from whom the Hurrians and the Elamites were descended. That group formed a branch of the so-called Alpine race, and spoke a language whose nearest relations must be sought in the modern Caucasus. Culturally it was characterized, in very early times, by the production of painted pottery and by the application of the knowledge of metallurgy. Was that group comparatively isolated, or did it have extensive connections with other ethnic elements? What went on in pro-ethnic times, before the Elamites and the Hurrians may be assumed to have divided into an eastern and a western group, we have not the means of judging. Such primordial conditions are entirely beyond our power to reconstruct even in their barest outlines. All we do have a right to assume is a pro-ethnic symbiosis of the ancestors of the Elamites and the Hurrians. For, to recapitulate once more, the extant philological material points to a common origin, and the similarities between the First and the Second Aeneolithic Cultures also suggest a single source; the distribution of the remains of those early civilizations indicates that the disseminating center must be looked for in the north, between the Black Sea and the Caspian. Now, it is not unlikely that this assumed center had some relations with the peoples of Central Asia in the east, whoever they may have been. It is even more probable that there was at the same time some degree of intercourse with other Alpine groups in the west, and possibly also with some Mediterranean peoples. All this is of course too speculative for serious consideration. These possibilities are mentioned only in order to indicate that even in remotest antiquity it may have been difficult for an ethnic group, which was in possession of the rudiments of civilization, to remain culturally and racially quite pure and uncontaminated.

We get on less uncertain ground when we pass the middle of the fourth millennium. The appearance of the Sumerians and of the Semites in Mesopotamia furnishes us with two new ethnic elements that join and eventually dispossess the original population. In Lower Mesopotamia the Elamite speech gives way to Sumerian, though the original population appears to adjust at least one dialect of Sumerian to its own phonetic habits. In the north and in the west the results of racial fusion may be estimated with more precision. The Hurrians, or their older relatives, are also compelled gradually to give up their dialects in favor of Semitic forms of speech. But in physical type it is the Semite who is in turn strongly influenced by the older inhabitants of the country.

This recessive quality of cultural elements coupled with an extraordinary tenacity of physical characteristics seems to be true of the Japhetic groups in general. The Elamites were able to maintain their speech only in the comparative isolation of the hills of Huzistan. The Kassites and the Hurrians could not fare so well in the plains. Not only do their languages give way to Semitic dialects, but they appear equally receptive to Indo-European influences. About the middle of the second millennium we find Indic gods in the pantheon of the Kassites as well as in that of the Hurrians, and the Mitannian Kikkuli employs at the same time good Indic technical terms. Further north, where the Indo-European influence was stronger, the changes are more thorough-going. The common speech of Anatolia is in the Amarna period Hittite, which is in its structural form an Indo-European language. In the following millennium Haldian is superseded by another Indo-European language, viz. Armenian. That the original physical characteristics were not sacrificed together with the languages is clear from the example of the present-day Armenians.

In view of these facts, it cannot be thought a too bold generalization when we say that the Elamites, Hurrians, and their congeners, formed the backbone of the ethnic groups in the Near East. From the south those peoples were pressed by the Semites,[21] from the north by the Indo-Europeans. These conditions must have obtained from very early times, and they are still largely true today. While the "Armenoid" type is so prevalent in the Near East, the languages of the "third ethnic element" are now to be found only in the Caucasian district, where the comparative difficulty of access contributed, no doubt, to the preservation of those dialects.

It does not appear that the other cultural elements of the oldest population of Mesopotamia fared better than the languages of that group. That the people in question could be culturally productive is proved amply by the magnificent civilization of Susa I, whose pottery has for sheer beauty of decoration few equals in the ancient world. But in Mesopotamia that pottery disappears completely with the arrival of the Sumerians. The long Kassite period is not impressive from an artistic point of view. On the other hand, the Hurrians appear to have had a keen sense for decorative arts. The fine mural paintings from Nuzi antedate the earliest known Assyrian wall paintings by several centuries, apart from representing the more finished and graceful effort. All in all, however, the ancient Japhethites of the Near East do not seem to have possessed a great amount of cultural independence. Politically, too, they required a stimulus from without wherever organizing ability was required. The kingdom of Mitanni was primarily, it would seem, the result of efforts on the part of an Indo-Iranian aristocracy.

---

[21] The perplexing question of Semitic origins does not concern us directly in the present work. Professor Barton has informed me personally that he is planning to rewrite his *Sketch of Semitic Origins* to bring it up to date. The older view that the Semites came from Arabia is now vigorously assailed by a number of modern scholars. This is not the place to go into details; a convenient summary of the various theories on the subject is given in Contenau, *Manuel d'archéologie orientale* I ch. III. Incidentally Contenau considers Amurru as the early home of the Semites (*ib.* p. 124). According to Ungnad (*Kulturfragen* I 5) the Semites and the Indo-Europeans formed originally one group, whose home is to be sought in Europe. One fact is only too frequently ignored in all these discussions. Semitic is linked philologically with Hamitic much more closely than with any other linguistic group; and of all the Semitic languages, Akkadian has preserved the greatest number of morphological features that are known otherwise from Hamitic languages (cf. especially Barth, *Die Pronominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen*, Leipzig 1913, XIV–XV). It follows that the home-land of the Semites must be sought in conjunction with that of the Hamites, since the philological correspondences in question presuppose a pro-ethnic Hamito-Semitic group. And whatever their ultimate place of origin may have been, it is very unlikely, to my thinking, that the proto-historic Hamito-Semites are to be sought anywhere else than in north Africa, and perhaps Arabia.

Yet we must not underestimate the rôle which the non-Semitic and non-Sumerian elements in Mesopotamia played in the political life of the land. The First Dynasty of Ur succumbed to the Elamitic rulers of Awan. The powerful rulers of Agade could not stave off defeat at the hands of the Gutians. The Third Dynasty of Ur is also brought to an end by the Elamites, whereupon the Sumerians disappear from the stage as a political factor;[22] the Elamite Kudur Mabuk is sufficiently master of Babylonia to impose upon it the rule of his two sons, Warad-Sin and Rim-Sin. It is evident, then, that the highlanders had in the third millennium as much to do with the shaping of the political destinies of Lower Mesopotamia as the Sumerians and Akkadians themselves.[23] In the second millennium the Kassites are the dominant power in Babylonia, following the brilliant period of Hammurabi and of the Amorite Dynasty. The entire history of Babylonia thus resolves itself into a constant struggle between the original population of the land and the Sumero-Akkadian invaders. A Mesannipadda, a Sargon, or a Hammurabi, may have succeeded in subduing and pacifying the mountaineers for a short time. But the latter, reinforced by kinsmen from the nearby hills, would invariably turn against the Sumerians or the Akkadians, eventually bringing about the downfall of their most powerful dynasties.

---

[22] The order of events in this connection tempts one to assume that there is something like poetic justice even in history. The Elamites were the first settlers in Lower Mesopotamia, as we have seen. In course of time they were forced, however, to yield their valuable lands to the invading Sumerians. Superior culture enabled the remarkably talented newcomers to stave off the counter-attacks of the hardier original stock for several centuries. Even after such serious setbacks as the overthrow of the First Dynasty of Ur the Sumerians were not to be denied. But the ultimate result could almost have been predicted. The complete elimination of the Sumerians from the political stage is accomplished at length by none other than Elam. Ibi-Sin, the hapless epigon

As for Assyria, that country was unable to enjoy complete independence for even as long as a thousand years, all told. About the middle of the second millennium Ashur is under the domination of the Hurrians. Little is known abut the earlier political conditions; at all events, the city-state of Ashur was founded by non-Semitic rulers. Here, too, it is necessary to interpret the history of the country in terms of the ceaseless struggle between the Semitic invaders and the older inhabitants of the land.

We will never be able to appreciate fully the cultural and

---

of a great race, is dragged away in fetters to Anshan where he weeps and begs for mercy (cf. *MF* 236). Unfortunately, it is the more refined and cultivated group which succumbs in this case. Their effort to become fully acclimated appears to have sapped the vitality of the Sumerians in the long and bitter contest.

[23] As is well known, not a few of the finest examples of Sumero-Akkadian art, as well as some invaluable literary monuments of Babylonia, were actually recovered at Susa, and not in their respective places of origin.

political events in the Valley of Two Rivers unless we give due consideration to the third ethnic element in that area, which in reality constituted the original population of the land. That group might be subdued for a long time, but it could never be completely suppressed. It might degenerate into cultural insignificance, but it always remained a powerful physical factor. In the millennia that have followed the destruction of Nineveh and of Babylon there has not been much change in the essential juxtaposition of the mountaineers and the plain-dwellers in the heart of the Near East. The Kurds and the Arabs face one another just as did the Elamites and the Sumerians, or the Hurrians and the Assyrians. In words of Professor Breasted,[24] it is "an age-long struggle between the mountain peoples of the north and the desert-wanderers of the grass-lands—a struggle which is still going on—for the possession of the Fertile Crescent."

[24] *Ancient Times* 101.

ABBREVIATIONS

And Principal Publications Cited

AASOR. Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research, New Haven.

AB. Assyriologische Bibliothek, Leipzig.

AfO. Archiv für Orientforschung, Berlin.

AJA. American Journal of Archaeology, Norwood, Mass.

Albright, W. F. "A Babylonian Geographical Treatise on Sargon of Akkad's Empire," *JAOS* 45 (1926) 193–245.

Id. "Proto-Mesopotamian Painted Ware from the Balikh Valley," *Man* XXVI (1925), no. 25.

Id. "The Anatolian Goddess Kubaba," *AfO* V (1929) 229 f.

Id. "The Readjustment of Assyro-Babylonian Chronology by the Elimination of False Synchronisms," *JSOR* VIII (1924) 51f.

Anderson, J. G. "Preliminary Report on Archaeological Research in Kansu," *Memoirs of the Geographical Survey of China,* Peking, 1925.

Antiq. J. Antiquaries Journal, London.

AO. Der alte Orient, Leipzig.

AOB I. Altorientalische Bibliothek, vol. I: "Die Inschriften der altassyrischen Könige," ed. by E. Ebeling, B. Meissner, and E. F. Weidner, Leipzig, 1926.

AOR. Archiv Orientální, Prague.

Autran Ch. "De quelques vestiges probables, méconnus jusqu'ici, du lexique méditerranéen dans le sémitique d'Asie Mineure, et notamment, de Canaan," *Journal Asiatique* 209 (1926) 1–79.

Id. *Sumérien et Indo-Européen: L'aspect morphologique de la question,* Paris, 1925.

Babyloniaca, Paris.

Barth, J. *Die Pronominalbildung in den Semitischen Sprachen*, Leipzig, 1913.

Barton, G. A. *Sketch of Semitic Origins, Social and Religious*, New York, 1902.

Id. *The Origin and Development of Babylonian Writing*, Leipzig, 1913.

Id. *RISA—The Royal Inscriptions of Sumer and Akkad*, New Haven, 1929.

Id. "Whence came the Sumerians," *JAOS* 49 (1929) 263 f.

BASOR. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, South Hadley, Mass.

Bauer, Theo. *Die Ostkanaanäer:* Eine philologish historische Untersuchung über die Wanderschicht der sogenannten "Amoriter" in Babylonien. Leipzig, 1926.

Bender, H. H. *The Home of the Indo-Europeans*, Princeton, 1922.

Bergsträsser, G. *Einführung in die semitischen Sprachen*, Munich, 1928.

Bilabel, F. *Geschichte Vorderasiens und Ägyptens vom 16–11. Jahrhundert* v. Chr., Heidelberg, 1927.

v. Bissing, Fr. W. "Probleme der ägyptischen Vorgeschichte," *AfO* V (1929) 41–81.

Id. "Die Überlieferung über die Schirdani," *WZKM* XXXIV (1927) 230–259.

Id. "Die Überlieferung über die Turuscha," *WZKM* XXXV (1928) 177–187.

Bleichsteiner, R. "Kaukasiche Sprachen," *RV* VI 260 ff.

Boghazköi-Studien, Leipzig.

Boissier, A. "Inscription de Narâm-Sin," *RA* XXIII (1919) 157–164.

Bork, F. "Das Sumerische eine kaukasische Sprache," *OLZ* (27) 1924: 169 ff.

Id. "Die Mitannisprache," *MVAG* XIV 1/2 (1909), Berlin.

Id. "Elam. B. Sprache," *RV* III (1925) 70–83.

Id. "Mitlani," *JRAS* 1928: 51–62.

Id. *Skizze des Lükischen*, Leipzig, 1926.

Boudou, P. "Liste des noms géographiques," *Orientalia*, nos. 36–38 (1929).

B o T U *Boghazköi Texte in Umschrift*, Leipzig.

Breasted, J. H. *Ancient Times*, Boston, 1914.

Burney, C. F. *The Book of Judges*, London, 1918.

C A H. *Cambridge Ancient History*, New York.

Chiera, E. *Inheritance Texts*, Paris, 1927.

Id. *Texts of Varied Contents: HSS* V, Cambridge, U. S. A., 1929.

Id. *Sumerian Lexical Texts*, Chicago, 1929.

Chiera, E. and Speiser, E. A. "A New Factor in the History of the Ancient East," *AASOR* VI (1926) 75–92.

Eid. "Selected Kirkuk Documents," *JAOS* 47 (1927) 36–60.

Childe, V. Gordon. *The Aryans*, New York, 1926.

Id. *The Most Ancient East*, New York, 1929.

Christian, V. "Altkleinasiatische Völker," *RLA* I 76–88.

Id. "Das erste Auftreten der Indogermanen in Vorderasien," *MAGW* LVIII (1928) 210–229.

Christian, V. and Weidner, E. F. "Das Alter der Gräberfunde aus Ur," *AfO* V (1929) 139–150.

Clay, A. T. *A Hebrew Deluge Story in Cuneiform*, *YOR* V 3, New Haven, 1922.

Id. *Personal Names of the Cassite Period*, *YOR* 1, New Haven 1912.

Corpus Inscriptionum Elamicarum, ed. by Fr. W. König, Hannover 1926 f.

Contenau, G. "Les tablettes de Kerkouk et les origines de la civilisation assyrienne," *Babyloniaca* IX (1926) nos. 2–4.

Id. *Manuel d'archéologie orientale*, I, Paris, 1927.

CT. Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum, London.

Deimel, A. *Pantheon babylonicum*, Rome, 1914.

Id. *Šumerische Grammatik der archaischen Texte*, Rome, 1924.

Delitzsch, Fr. *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch*, Leipzig, 1896.

Id. *Die Sprache der Kossäer*, Leipzig, 1884.

Id. *Wo lag das Paradies?*, Leipzig, 1881.

Dhorme, P. "Abraham dans le cadre de l'histoire," *RB* 1928: 367–385; 481–511.

Id. "L'aurore de l'histoire babylonienne," *RB* 1924: 533–556; *ib.* 1926: 66–82; 223–239; 535–548.

Id. "Les Amorrhéens," *RB* 1928: 63–79; 161–180.

Dirr, A. *Einführung in das Studium der kaukasischen Sprachen*, Leipzig, 1927.

Driver, G. R. "The Name Kurd in its philological connexions," *JRAS* 1923: 393–403.

Ebeling, E. *Babylonisch-assyrische Texte*, in Gressmann, *Altorientalische Texte zum Alten Testament*, Berlin, 1926.

Edmonds, C. J. "Two Ancient Monuments in Kurdistan," *Geographical Journal* LXV 63 f.

E H A. See Smith, S.

Ehelolf, H. "Ein Wortfolgeprinzip im Assyrisch-Babylonischem," *Leipziger Semitische Studien* VI, no. 3 (1916).

Enzyklopädie des Islām, Leiden-Leipzig, 1913 ff.

F M. *Festschrift Meissner: Altorientalische Studien Bruno Meissner zum sechzigsten Geburtstage gewidmet*, Leipzig, 1928–9.

Fick, A. *Ḫattiden und Danubier in Griechenland*, Göttingen, 1909.

Id. *Vorgriechische Ortsnamen als Quelle für die Vorgeschichte Griechenlands*, Göttingen, 1905.

Forrer, E. *Bo T U: Boghazköi Texte in Umschrift*, Leipzig.

Id. "Die Inschriften und Sprachen des Hatti-Reiches," *ZDMG* LXXVI (1922) 174–269.

Id. "Für die Griechen in den Boghazköi Inschriften," *KAF* I (1929) 252 ff.

Frank, C. "Fremdsprachige Glossen in assyrischen Listen und Vokabularen," *FM* 36–45.

Frankfort, H. *Studies: Studies in Early Pottery of the Near East.* Vol. I (1924), and vol. II (1927), London.—*Occasional Papers of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 6, 8.

Id. "Sumerians and Semites and the Origin of Copper Working," *Antiq. J.* VIII (1928) 217 ff.

Friedrich, J. "Altkleinasiatische Sprachen," *RV* I 126–142.

Id. "Die hethitischen Bruchstücke des Gilgameš-Epos," *ZA* XXXIX 1–82.

G A. See Meyer, E. *Geschichte des Altertums.*

Gadd, C. J. *HMU: History and Monuments of Ur*, New York, 1929.

Id. *Kirkuk: Tablets from Kirkuk, RA* XXIII (1926) 49–161.

Gautier, J. E. and Lampre, G. "Fouilles à Moussian," *MDEP* VIII 59–148.

Glotta. Zeischrift für griechische und lateinische Sprache, Göttingen.

Glotz, G. *La civilisation égéenne*, Paris, 1913.

Götze, A. "Zur Kelishin Stele," *ZA* XXXIX (1929) 99–128.

Id. *Das Hethiter-Reich, AO* XXVII no. 2 (1928).

Gustavs, A. *Taannek: Die Personennamen in den Tontafeln von Tell Ta'annek* (Eine Studie zur Ethnographie Nordpalästinas zur El-Amarna-Zeit), Leipzig, 1928.

Hall, R. H. *Ancient History of the Near East*, London, 1913.

Id. "The Caucasian Origin of the Peoples of the Sea," *Klio* XXII (1928) 335–344.

Id. and Woolley, L. C. *Excavations at Ur I: Al 'Ubaid*, London, 1927.

Herzfeld, E. "Reisebericht," *ZDMG* LXXX (1926) 225–284.

H G T. See Poebel.

H M U. Cf. Gadd.

Hommel, E. "Der Name und die Legende des Jordan in altkanaanäischer Zeit," *JSOR* XI (1927) 169 ff.

Hommel, Fr. "Die elamische Götter-Siebenheit," *Oriental Studies dedicated to Paul Haupt* 159–168, Leipzig, 1926.

Id. *Ethnologie: Ethnologie und Geographie des alten Orients*, Munich, 1926.

Hrozný, F. "Churri," *AOR* I (1929) 91 ff.

Id. "Über die Völker und Sprachen des alten Chatti-Reiches," Boghazköi-Studien 5 (1920).

H S S. *Harvard Semitic Series*, Cambridge, U. S. A.

H T. See Poebel.

Hüsing, G. "*Annubani-Annubani-ni*," *OLZ* (10) 1907: 234 f.

Id. "Die elamische Sprachforschung," *Memnon* IV (1910) 5–40.

Id. "Die Kassiteriden," *OLZ* (10) 1907; 25 f.

Id. *Die Sprache Elams*, Breslau, 1908.

Id. "Kaspisches," *OLZ* (20) 1917: 106–108; 178–181; 205–209; *ib.* (21) 1918: 43; 48; 264–272.

Id. *Quellen: Die einheimischen Quellen zur Geschichte Elams*, *AB* XXIV 1, Leipzig, 1916.

Id. "Palatale Spirans in Lullu-Land?" *OLZ* (6) 1903: 399–402.

Id. *Zagros: Der Zagros und seine Völker*, *AO IX* nos. 3–4, Leipzig, 1908.

Id. "Zur elamischen Genetivkonstruktion," *OLZ* (8) 1905: 549–553.

JAOS. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, New Haven.

JEA. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, London.

Jean, Ch. F. "Larsa d'apres les textes cunéiformes," *Babyloniaca* X (1927) 161–237.

Jensen, P. *Assyrisch-babylonische Mythen und Epen*, *KB* VI (1900), Berlin.

Jeremias, A. *Handbuch der altorientalischen Geisteskultur*, Leipzig, 1929.

Jespersen, O. *Language*, New York, 1924.

JRAS. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, London.

Jirku, A. *Die Wanderungen der Hebräer im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, *AO* XXIV 2 (1924).

JSOR. *Journal of the Society of Oriental Research*, Toronto.

KAH. *Keischrifttexte aus Assur historischen Inhalts*, vv. I and II, Berlin.

KAF. *Kleinasiatische Forschungen*, Leipzig.

KAV. *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenen Inhalts*, Leipzig.

KB. *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, Berlin.

King, L. W. *Chronicles Concerning Early Babylonian Kings*, vv. I–II, London, 1907.

Klio. *Beiträge zur alten Geschichte*, Leipzig.

Kluge, Th. "Über das Etruskische und seine Stellung zu den kaukasischen Sprachen," *Memnon* III (1909–10) 169 ff.

Id. *Welcher Sprachengruppe ist das Sumerische anzugliedern?*, Leipzig, 1921.

Knudtzon, J. A. *Amarna: Die El-Amarna-Tafeln, VAB* II, Leipzig, 1915.

Kohler-Ungnad. *Assyrische Rechtsurkunden*, Leipzig, 1913.

König, Fr. W. *Drei altelamische Stelen*, Leipzig, 1925.

Id. "Mutterrecht und Thronfolge im alten Elam," *Festschrift der Nationalbibliothek Wien* (1926) 529–552.

Koschaker, P. *NRA: Neue keilschriftliche Rechtsurkunden aus der El-Amarna-Zeit*, Leipzig, 1928.

Kretschmer, P. "Das *nt*-Suffix," *Glotta* XIV (1925) 84–106.

Id. "Der Name der Lykier und andere kleinasiatische Völkernamen," *KAFI* (1927) 1–18.

Id. "Die protoindogermanische Schicht," *Glotta* XIV (1925) 300–319.

Id. *Einleitung: Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*, Göttingen, 1896.

Landsberger, B. *Der kultische Kalender der Babylonier und Assyrer, Leipziger Semitische Studien VI*, nos. 1–2 (1915).

Id. "Ḫabiru und Lulaḫḫu," *KAF* I (1929) 321–334.

Id. Über die Völker Vorderasiens im dritten Jahrtausend," *ZA* XXXV (192) 213–238.

Langdon, S. *Ausgrabungen in Babylonien seit 1918, AO* XXVI (1928).

Id. *Excavations at Kish*, Paris, 1924.

Id. *The Weld-Blundell Collection in the Ashnolean Museum, OECT* I–II, Oxford, 1923.

Id. *Pictographic Inscriptions from Jemdet Nasr, OECT* VII, Oxford, 1928.

Language. *Journal of the Linguistic Society of America*, Baltimore.

Leander, P. *Über die Sumerischen Fremdwörter im Assyrischen*, Uppsala, 1903.

Legrain, L. *Empreintes des cachets élamites, MDEP* XVI, 1921.

Id. "Gem Cutters in Ancient Ur," *Museum Journal* 1929: 258–306.

Id. *Historical Fragments*, *PBS* XIII, Philadelphia, 1922.

Id. "*The Boudoir of Queen Shubad*," *Museum Journal* 1929: 211–245.

Lehmann-Haupt, C. F. *Armenien einst und jetzt*, vv. I–II, 1910–1926.

Lewy, J. "Ḫabiru und Hebräer," *OLZ* (30) 1927: 738–741; 825–833.

v. Luschan, F. *Voelker, Rassen, Sprachen*, Berlin, 1922.

M A G W. *Mitteilungen der anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien*, Vienna.

Man. *A Monthly Record of Anthropological Science*, London.

Marr, N. *Der japhetitische Kaukasus und das dritte ethnische Element im Bildungsprozess der mittelländischen Kultur*, Berlin, 1923.

Matz, F. *Die frühkretischen Siegel*, Berlin, 1928.

M D E P. *Mémoirs de la Délégation en Perse*, Paris.

M D O G. *Mitteilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*, Berlin.

Meissner, B. *Babylonien und Assyrien*, vv. I–II, Heidelberg, 1920–1924.

Id. *Beiträge zum altbabylonischen Privatrecht*, *AB* II, Leipzig, 1893.

Id. *Seltene assyrische Ideograme*, Leipzig, 1910.

Id. "Sumerer und Semiten in Babylonien," *AfO* V (1929) 1–11.

Memnon. *Zeitschrift für Kunst- und Kultur-Geschichte des alten Orients*, Berlin-Stuttgart-Leipzig.

Meyer, E. "Die ältesten datierten Zeugnisse der iranischen Sprache und der zoroastrischen Religion," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* XLII (1909) 1–27.

Id. *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*, Halle, 1906.

Id. *GA. Geschichte des Altertums*, 1, 2, 4th ed., Stuttgart, 1921.

Id. *Sumerer und Semiten in Babylonien*, Berlin, 1906.

Minorsky, V. "Kurden," *Enzyklopädie des Islam* II 1212–1237.

de Morgan, J. *La préhistoire orientale*, vv. I–III, Paris, 1925–1927.

Id. *Les premières civilisations*, Paris, 1909.

Museum Journal, Philadelphia.

Nassouhi, E. "Grande liste des rois d'Assyrie," *AfO* IV (1927) 1–11.

N R A. See Koschaker.

O E C T. *Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Texts*, Oxford.

Olmstead, A. T. *History of Assyria*, New York, 1923.

O L Z. *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, Leipzig.

Orientalia: Commentarii de rebus Assyro-Babylonicis, Arabicis, Aegyptiacis, etc., Rome.

P B S. *Publications of the Babylonian Section of the University of Pennsylvania Museum*, Philadelphia.

Pézard, M. *Mission à Bender-Bushire, MDEP* XV.

Pinches, Th. "The Language of the Kassites," *JRAS* 1917: 101–114.

Poebel, A. "Eine neue sumerische Mundart," *ZA* XXXIX (1929) 129–139.

Id. *HGT: Historical and Grammatical Texts, PBS* V (1914).

Id. *HT: Historical Texts, PBS* IV 1 (1914).

Id. *SG: Sumerische Grammatik*, Rostock, 1923.

Poplicha, J. "The Biblical Nimrod and the Kingdom of Eanna," JAOS 49 (1929) 303 ff.

Pottier, E. *Céramique peinte de Suse et petits monuments*, MDEP XIII (1912).

Id. "Une théorie nouvelle sur les vases de Susa," *RAR* XXIII (1926) 1–39.

Prentice, W. K. "The Achaeans", *AJA* XXXIII 206–218.

Przeworski, S. "Les problèmes mycénniens et les texts hittites," repr. fr. *Eos* XXVIII, Lemberg, 1925.

Id. *Studja: Studja nad ośiadnictwem i rolą Hetytów w środkowej Anatolji*, Warsaw, 1929.

R A. *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale*, Paris.

R A R. *Revue archéologique*, Paris.

R B. *Revue Biblique*, Paris.

R L A. *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, Berlin-Leipzig.
R V. Ebert, *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte*, Berlin.
R I S A. See Barton.
Rostovtzeff, M. *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*, Oxford, 1922.
Id. "The Sumerian Treasure of Astrabad," *JEA* VI (1920) 1–27.
de Sarzec and Heuzey. *Découvertes en Chaldée*, vv. I–II, Paris, 1884–1912.
Schaeffer, F. H. "Les fouilles de Minet-el-Beida et de Ras Shamra," *Syria* X (1929) 285–302.
Scheil, P. *Textes élamites-sémitiques*, *MDEP* II, IV, VI, X.
Id. *Textes élamites-anzanites*, *MDEP* III, V, IX, XI.
Id. *Textes de comptabilité proto-élamites, nouvelle série*, *MDEP* XVII.
Schnabel, P. *Berossos und die babylonisch-hellenistische Literatur*, Leipzig, 1923.
Schorr, M. *Altbabylonische Rechtsurkunden*, Leipzig, 1913.
Sköld, H. "Sur la lettre en langue Mitanni," *JRAS* 1926: 667–678.
Smith, S. *EHA: Early History of Assyria*, New York, 1927.
Speiser, E. A. "A Letter of Saushshatar and the Date of the Kirkuk Tablets," *JAOS* 49 (1929) 269–275.
Id. *Preliminary Excavations at Tepe Gawra*, *AASOR* IX (1929).
Id. *Southern Kurdistan in the Annals of Ashurnasirpal and Today*, *AASOR* VIII (1928).
Id. See Chiera-Speiser.
Stephens, F. J. *Personal Names from Cuneiform Inscriptions from Cappadocia*, *YOR* XIII 1, 1928.
Sturtevant, E. H. "On the Position of Hittite among Indo-European Languages," *Language* II 25–34.
Sundwall, J. *Die einheimischen Namen der Lykier selbst einem Verzeichnisse kleinasiatischer Namenstämme*, Leipzig, 1913.
Syria. *Revue d'art oriental et d'archéologie*, Paris.
Tallquist, K. L. *Assyrian Personal Names*, Leipzig, 1914.

Thompson, R. C. "Abu-Shahrain," *Archaeologia* LXX (1920) 109–124.

Thureau-Dangin, F. *Le Syllabaire accadien*, Paris, 1926.

Id. *Sargon: Une relation de la huitième campagne de Sargon*, Paris, 1912.

Trombetti, A. *Elementi di glottologia*, Bologna, 1922.

v. Tseretheli, M. *Die neuen ḫaldischen Inschriften König Sardurs von Urarṭu*, Heidelberg, 1928.

Id. "Sumerian and Georgian," *JRAS* 1913–1915.

Ungnad, A. *Babylonische Briefe aus der Zeit der Ḫammurapi-Dynastie*, *VAB* VI, Leipzig, 1914.

Id. *Die ältesten Völkerwanderungen Vorderasiens.* (Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Semiten, Arier, Hethiter und Subaräer), *Kulturfragen* 1, Breslau, 1923.

Id. "Sumerische und chinesische Schrift," *WZKM* XXXIV (1927) 76–86.

URI. *Royal Inscriptions from Ur*, ed. Gadd and Legrain, (Publications of the Joint Expedition of the British Museum and the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania to Mesopotamia) Philadelphia, 1928.

VAB. *Vorderasiatische Bibliothek*, Leipzig.

Virolleaud, Ch. "Les tablettes cunéiformes de Mishrifé-Ḳaṭna," *Syria* IX (1928) 90–96.

Id. "Les inscriptions cunéiformes de Ras Shamra," *Syria* X (1929) 303 ff.

Weidner, E. F. "Die grosse Königsliste aus Assur," *AfO* III 66–77.

Id. "Historisches Material in der babylonischen Omina-Literatur," *FM* 226–240.

Id. See Christian-Weidner.

Winkler, Heinrich. *Die Sprache der zweiten Columne der dreisprachigen Inschriften und das Altaische*, Breslau, 1896.

Wirth, A. "Kasische Forschungen," *Memnon* III (1909–1910) 1–48.

Woolley, L. C. *The Sumerians*, Oxford, 1928.

Id. See Hall-Woolley.

Worrell, W. H. *A Study of Races in the Ancient Near East*, Cambridge, 1927.

W Z K M. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Vienna.

Y O R. *Yale Oriental Series*, New Haven.

Z A. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete*, Berlin-Leipzig.

Z D M G. *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellshaft*, Leipzig.

Zimmern, H. *Akkadische Fremdwörter als Beweis für babylonischen Kultureinfluss*, Leipzig, 1917.

Id. "Die altbabylonischen vor- (und nach-) sintflutlichen Könige nach neuen Quellen," *ZDMG* LXXVIII (1924) 19–35.

INDEX

Aannipadda, King of Ur, 34.
Abalgamaš, Gutian origin of, 44.
Adab, 94, 125.
Adamdun, 41, 91.
Adasi, 90.
Aegean area: linguistic elements of, 23; place names, 6 f.; population of, 5; relations with Anatolia, 21.
Aeneolithic civilizations, 2; First Style: 82, 147, 152, 167; chronology of, 73; expansion of, 60 f.; origin of, 67, 173; racial background of, 67 f.; Second Style: 70 f.; alleged Gutian background of, 108 f.; expansion of, 72 f., 76 f.; origin of, 77 f., 80, 173; racial background of, 78 f.; relation to Jemdet Nasr remains, 72; spread by the Hurrians, 147.
Agade, origin of the name, 54, 143.
ak-suffix: in Elam, 40 ff.; in Gutian, 98; in Kassite, 122; in Sumer 40 ff; cf. *k*-suffix.
Akkad, probably rendered as *Luluina*, 119.
Akkadian, language: glosses in syllabaries, 54; influence of ethnic substrata, 155, 171; phonology of, 47; relation to *Eme Sal*, 53 f.
Akkadians, earliest appearance in Mesopotamia, 47.
Akshak, 43, 45.
Alarodians, 14.
Aleppo, origin of the name, 154.
Alman, 92; cf. Arman, Halman, Ialman.
Alpine stock, 10, 21, 173.
Amorites, in Mesopotamia, 5; in Palestine, 162, in prehistoric Sumer, 152 f.
Amurru, 156, 175; place names in the land of, 155 f.
an-suffix: in Elaminte territories, 41, 91; in Gutian, 98; in Hurrian, 144 f.; in Lullu, 92; in the Zagros generally, 94.
Anau, pottery of, 65, 67.
Anatolia, cultures of, 2, 22; languages of, 8; peoples of, 164 f.
Anatolian, physical type, 167; cf. Armenoid.
Annubanini, 89.
Anshan, 32, 177; various spellings of the name, 27.
Anubanini, of Kuta, 89.
Apirak, 43.
ar-element, in Hurrian, 145.
Arakdi, 145.
Arbilum, 145; see Urbilum.
Archaeology, comparative study of, 19 f.
ari-suffix, in Hurrian, 139 f.
Arisen, 144, 148.
Arman, in Lullu, 89, 92, cf. Halman, Alman; in Amurru, 154.
Armenia, 111, 119, 167 f.; connections with Susa I, 66; see Urarṭu, Uruaṭri.
Armenoid stock, 10 f., 15, 117, 175.
Arrapha: 95, 119, 145; documents from, 130; as neighbor of Lullu, 88; slaves from, 103 f.
Aryans, 101, 117; in Mesopotamia, 122; cf. Indo-Europeans.
Arzuhina, 140, 145.
aš-suffix: in Gutian, 97 f.; in Hurrian, 146; in Kassite, 98, 122.
Ashnunnak, Eshnunnak, 43, 98.
Assyria, ethnic strains in, 177; language of, 155.

INDEX

Assyrians, 5; laws of, 157; origin of, 156 f.; physical type of, 155; relations with the Guti, 109 f.

at-suffix, 95, 143 f.; in Syria, 154; see *ti*, *di*-suffix.

Atlila, city in the land of the Lullu, 100.

Awak, see Awan.

Awan, 43, 91, 145, 148, 176; Dynasty of, Elamite in origin, 35 f.; identity with Awak, 40 f.; in coalition with Elam, 31.

Balih, king of Kish, 150 f.; river, 156.

Barahsi, -she, 43, 96, 98, 100, 125 f., 141 f.; in coalition with Elam, 31; location of, 91; proper names from the region of, 44; variant spellings of the name, 31.

Bazai, king of Ashur, 90.

Boghazkoi, archives of, 8.

Canaan, language(s) of, 155; mentioned in the Kirkuk tests, 141.

Cappadocia, linguistic elements of, 17, 140; Cappadocian tablets, 165.

Carduchi, Karduchi, 115, 141.

Caspian, language, 17.

Casite, term employed by Caucasian philologists, 15.

Caucasian: general hypothesis, 10 f.; languages: 7, 9 ff.; classification of, 12, 17; unscientific treatment of, 13 f.; relation to Elamite and Hurrian, 130 f.; peoples, 172; philology, status of, 12 f.; relations with the Peoples of the Sea, 23; rival term for Japhethite, 15.

centum-languages, 18, 165.

Copper, importance of, in ancient civilizations, 2; implements of, 20.

Cuneiform writing, origin of, 74 f; cf. writing.

Cylinder seals, 67, 77, 84.

Damascus, origin of the name, 154.

damqu, synonym of *namru*, 107 f.

di-suffix, 54, 143; cf. *at*, *ti*-suffix.

Eannatum, wars with Elam, 30, 36.

Egypt, early contact with Sumer, 2; alleged connections with the Caucasus, 11.

ehli, element in Hurrian proper names, 145.

Elam, *passim*; civilization of, 170; early history of, 29 f.; epigraphic sources for the study of, 27; etymology of the name, 26, 87, 94; variant names of, 26; people of, 87; wars with Eannatum, 30, 36; with Kish, 36 f.; with Sargon of Agage, 30 f.; position among ancient cultures, 2.

Elamite, language: connection with the Caucasian group, 7, 52, 130 f.; decipherment of, 27 f.; four millennia of its history, 28; traces of palatalization, 55; phonology, 28; relation with the Lullu language, 93; suffixes, 29, 91; districts, 31; dynasty in Sumer and Akkad, 32; origin of the Dynasty of Awan, 35 f.; studies, 7.

Elamites: alleged relations with Sicilians, 9; original population of Lower Mesopotamia, 68; precede the Sumerians, 46; put an end to the political history of the Sumerians, 176; related to the Hurrians, 164, 173.

el-Obeid, temple of Ninkhursag, 34; prehistoric remains, 64, 67.

Elymites, 94.

Eme Ku, 49 f.

Eme Sal: 49 f.; geographic distribution of, 53; mentioned as language of Akkad, 53 f.; palatalization, 56; possible origin of the name, 56 f.; probable influence upon the

name "Shumer," 55; treatment of the *g*-sound, 50 f.; spoken by originally non-Sumerian population, 52 f.
Enmerkar, king of Uruk, 152.
Eridu, etymology of the name, 39 f.
Ethnic connotations, 3; map in the third millennium, 5; substratum in Sumer, 47 f., 52; in Assyria, 124 f.; in Syria and Palestine, 155.
Etruscans, 24; language of, 17.

Fair complexion, its alleged ethnic significance, 103 ff.

g-sound, treatment of in *Eme Sal*, 50 f.
gi-suffix, 154.
Gilgamesh Epic, 150, 159 f.; Hittite fragments of, 160; Hurrian fragments of, 160.
Greece, mainland of: dependence upon Anatolia, 21.
Gutebum, probable connection with the name of the Guti, 100, 143.
Guti, the 5, 88, 89 f., 96 f.; origin of the name, 143.
Gutian, Gutians, *passim;* alleged Aryanization of, 101 f.; connection with Aeneolithic II, 108 f.; with Jemdet Nasr, 73; description in Assyrian annals, 111; early appearance in Sumer, 99; ethnic affiliations, 97; history in Assyrian times, 109; in the Central Zagros, 97 f.; kings, 97 f., 109; regarded as Indo-Europeans, 101; as Semites, 101; relationship with the Lullu, 99; language: 138, 166; elements of, 97 ff.; names, 44, 99, 109; origin of the name Lagash, 99; relationship with the dialects of Lullu, Barahsi, 98.
Gutium, Dynasty of, 97, 149; language, people of, 87; possible connection with Gutebum, 100.

h-suffix, in Hurrian, 139 f., 151; see *hi*-suffix.
Ha. A, Sumerian cities, 38 f., 45; cf. Shubari.
Habiru, 162.
Hadanish, king of Hamazi, 43, 98.
Haldian, language: 8, 17, 145, 168 f.; study of, 14; suffixes, 119; verbal elements, 168 f.
Haldians, 119.
Haligalbat, 95, 123, 135; cf. Hanigalbat.
Hallapi, native name of the Elamites, 94.
Halman, 88 f., 92, 97; cf. Arman, Ialman.
Hamitic: group, 4, 9, 175; relation to Semitic, 9, 175; physical type, 5.
Hani, 144.
Hanigalbat, 111, 135; etymology of the name, 144; interchange with Haligalbat, 95; variant forms of, 95.
Hamazi, Dynasty of, 43.
Hapirti, 26.
Hatamti, 26.
Hattic, 135; possible connections with Kassite, 123; cf. proto-Hittite.
Hepa, 146.
hi-suffix, in Hurrian, 118 f.
Highland culture, 87; cf. Aeneolithic I.
Highlanders, as rival term for Caucasians, 15.
Hittite, language: correct name for, 18; its Indo-Europeanized character, 17 f.
Horites, etymology of the name, 133.
Hozi, language, 28; cf. Elamite.
Hubaba, Huwawa, 160.
Humban, 89.
Hurri, connection with Horites, 131 f.; interchangeable with Mitanni, 131; reading of name ascertained, 130 f;

traces of name in Egypt and Palestine, 132; in the Septuagint, 132.
Hurri-Mitanni, language, 8.
Hurrian, *passim*; language: elements of, 114, 136; in Boghazkoi, 130; in Ras Shamra, 163; in Syria, 154; relationship with Elamite, 137; with Haldian, 168 f.; suffixes 118 f. 151; proper names: 138 ff., 151; in Palestine, 133 f.; in Syria, 154. phonology, 139, 142.; version of the Gilgamesh Epic, 160.
Hurrians, *passim*; alleged blondness of, 104 f.; art of, 176; connection with Aeneolithic II, 80; with Jemdet Nasr. 147 f.; ethnic stock in Anatolia, 8; geographic distribution of, 125 ff.; in Akkad, in the 4th millennium, 148 f.; in Palestine, 134, 147, 161; in the Amarna letters, 118; mistaken for Hittites, 134 f.; name of, 135 f. (cf. Subareans); traces of possible influence in the Bible, 161 f.; relation with the Caucasian group, 136; with the Elamites, 164; with the Habiru, 162; with the Semites, 153; rulers of, 109 f.
Hurlāš, *Hurlēš*, *Hurluš*, 130.
Hurlili, 130.
Hurlū, 131.
Huzistan, 174.
Hypo-brachycephalic group, 10 f.

Iakulaba, of Ashur, probably of Gutian origin, 109.
Ialman, 92.
Ibi-Sin, of Ur, 31 f., 176 f.
ilku, 146.
India, within the group of ancient cultures, 2.
Indo-Europeans, 120; dominant racial type, 6; elements of in Anatolia, 8; in Mesopotamia, 101, 122, 135; in the Zagros, 101, 174 f.; cf. Aryans.
Indus valley, connections with Mesopotamia, 76.
ip-element, in Hurrian, 94.
Iranian elements, 169.
irwi, *iwri*, 145.
irwišši, 146.

Japhethite, application of the term, 15 f.; languages, 167; term does not imply genetic relationship, 16 f.; theory of N. Marr, 13.
Japhethites, 18, 171 f., 176; in philological and archaeological sources, 22; interrelationship of, 22.
Japhetic, 16 f.; lands, archaeology of, 19 f.; linguistic elements, 94, 163; peoples, 120, 156, 172.
Jemdet Nasr, connection with Susa II, 72; finds from, 75; language of the inscriptions, 74 f.; pictographs, 72 ff.; race probably of non-Sumerian origin, 74 f.; tablets, 69 ff., 74 f.
Jews, physical type of, 155, 162.

k-suffix, 142; in Elamite, 29, 91; in Lullu, 91; cf. *ak*-suffix.
Kaneshite, suggested designation for the Hittite language, 18.
Karduchi, see Carduchi.
K αρδοῦχοι, 115, 118.
Kas-pi, alleged native name of the Kassites, 124.
Kassite, language, 121 ff., 138, 166; relationship with Elamite, 122 f.; traces of connections with proto-Hittite (Hattic), 123, 166. Dynasty, 121; invasion, 32.
Kassites, *passim*; name as found in the Kirkuk tablets, 119.
Kaššu, Kashshu, 121 f.
Kazallu, 153 f.
Kengir, 55.

Kenturipa, 94.

Kikia, Kikkia, 109 f., 140.

Kimash, 98, 144; new Sumerian dialect from, 57.

Kinahhi, oldest occurrence of the name, 141.

King lists, 33 ff.

Kish, early rulers of, 150; First Dynasty of, 36; Second Dynasty of, 36.

K οσσαῖο, 121.

Kudur Mabuk, Elamite ruler, 32; attitude towards Amorites, 153.

Kullab, origin of the name, 94.

Kummuhi, neighbors of the Guti, 112 ff.

Kurd, alleged etymology of the name, 116.

Kurdistan, 111, 115 f., 117.

Kurds, originally of Zagros stock, 117 f.; physical characteristics of, 117 f.; racial heterogeneity of the people, 117; various designations for, 115 f.; present position in the Near East, 178.

Kuššu, 124.

Kuššuhai, name of Kassites in the Kirkuk documents, 119, 121, 124, 141.

l-suffix, in Hurrian, 146, 160 f.

Labial elements and suffixes, in Elamite, 29; in Gutian, 100, 114; in Hurrian, 94, 142, 154 (in Syrian names); assimilated before *n* in Hurrian, 145; occurrence in Lullu, 93 f.; in Sicily, 94; in south-Mesopotamian names, 45, 94; in the Zagros area, 92.

Labio-velars, traces of in *Eme Sal*, 51 f.

laga, Gutian formative element, 99.

Lagash, origin of the name, 99; wars with Elam, 30 ff.

Larak, prediluvian city, 38 f.; writing of the name, 45.

Larsa, cited as prediluvian city, 38; variant names, 38, 45.

Linguistic relationship, 3; linguistic paleontology, 37 f.

Liquids, interchange of, in Hurrian, 139, 145; in Lullu, 92; in Sumerian, 92; interchange with nasals, 95; in Central Zagros and in Hattic, 123.

Lugalannimundu, king of Adab, inscription of, 125.

Lulahhu, in the Boghazkoi texts, their connection with the Lullu, 95.

Lullā-awīlu, 96.

Lullai, king of Ashur, 90, 110.

Lullu, country of, 87 f.; spread of the name, 95; history of, 5, 89, 90; kings of Assyria of Lullu origin, 90 f.; neighbors of, 96; language; 138, 166; palatalization, 57; relationship with Elamite, 93; with Gutian, 99; suffixes, 93; variant forms of the name, 93. proper names, 44; 94 f.; in Syria, 154, 163. Lullu servants, slaves, 95, 105.

Lullubati, the country of the Lullubi, 143.

Lullubī, the people of Lullu, 88, 95, 124, 143; etymology of the name, 93; similar name in Sicily, 94.

Lullumē, 93; in Assyrian annals, 110 f.

Luluina, apparently a designation of Akkad, 95, 119.

Luristan, 119.

Lurs, 95.

Lycia, proper names, 7; language of, 17.

Maiteni, older form of Mitanni, 129, 135.

mati-suffix, 144.

Mediterranean race, 5, 10, 21, 173.

Mesannipadda, king of Ur, 1, 34, 149, 177.

Metallurgy, 173; application of, 60; probability of Caucasian origin, 22; invention of, 62 f.

Metallic types, 64.

Mitanni, name interchanges with Subari, 129; with Hurri, 131; kingdom of, 128 f.; relation with Hurri, 135; position in Assyria, 109.

Mitannian letter of Tushratta, cf. Tushratta.

Mitlani, alleged variant for Mitanni, 129.

Mohammed Jaffar, mound of, 59.

Mohammedabad, pottery of, 65.

Musyan, pottery of, 59, 63, 77; remains of Aeneolithic II, 72.

Nahmaulel, a character in the Hurrian version of the Gilgamesh Epic, 160 f.

Namar, Nawar, 130, 148.

namru, 102 f.; meaning of, 106 f.

Naram-Sin, conquers Subartu, 126; defeated by the Guti, 88; reaches Syria, 154; stele of, 88 f.; wars with the Lullu, 88 f.

Nasals, interchange with liquids, 95, 123.

nd, *nt*-element, in Anatolia, 165 f.; in Lullu, 166; in the Zagros, 92.

Neolithic man, 2.

Neshites, probable name of the Indo-Europeanized Hittites, 18.

Noah, possible etymology of the name, 161.

Nordic, racial element, 6, 10.

Nullu, Nulluai, variants of Lullu, 93, 95.

p-suffix, in Elamite, 29; cf. *ip*, labial suffix.

Palatalization, in Elamite, 55; in *Eme Sal*, 56; in Lullu, 57, 92.

Palestine, connections with Aeneolithic II, 76, 79; cultural relations with Babylonia, 157 f.

Philistines, Anatolian origin of, 24.

Pictographic script, in Elam, 20, 71, 74; in Jemdet Nasr, 72 f.; in the Indus valley, 75.

Paharrashe, Hurrian city, 44.

Parahsi, see Barahsi.

Place names, in Anatolian districts, 165 f.; in Hurrian, 140 ff.; in Lullu, 94 f.; in Syria (Hurrian) 154; prediluvian, in Sumer, 38; pre-Grecian, 6 f.; similar in formation to personal names, 91, 98; toponymic and topographical studies, 87.

Polychrome ware, 20, 72; from Tepe Gawra, 77.

Pottery, painted, 20 f.; in northern Mesopotamia, 64 f.; non-Sumerian origin of, 69; see Aeneolithic I and II.

Prediluvian, cities, 38 f.; kings of Mesopotamia, 158 f.; patriarchs, 158 f.

Pronominal elements, in Haldian and in Hurrian, 168 f.

Proto-Elamites, 52, 147, 152; cf. Elamites.

Proto-Hittites, 8, 134 f., 156, 165 f.; cf. Hattic; language of, alleged relationship with the Caucasian group, 165, 167; analogies between proto-Hittite and Kassite, 123, 166.

Proto-Indo-Europeans, in Anatolia, 18, 166 f.; in the Aegean area, 18.

Qaṭna, city in Syria, 95 f., 138, 143, 154, 163.

Qurti, in Assyrian annals, 112 ff.; relation to the Guti, 114 f.; personal names of, 114.

Qutī, variant of Guti, 110 f.

INDEX

r-suffix, in Elamite, 29, 40; indicative of Elamite origin, 42; in Hurrian, 139 f., in Lullu, 91; in south-Mesopotamian names, 39 ff; cf. *ar*, *ari*-suffix.
Ras Shamra, tablets from, 163.

š-suffix, in Gutian, 98; in Lullu, 91; cf. *aš*, *si*-suffix; sibilant formatives and suffixes.
Samarra, pottery of, 65, 67.
Saniru, origin of the name, 154.
Sargon of Agade, wars with Elam, 30 f.
Satawatti, Indo-European name in Hurrian texts, 135.
satem-languages, 18, 168.
Saushshatar, king of Maiteni, letter of, 100, 135.
Seals, from Susa II, 71; from Jemdet Nasr, 72; cf. cylinder seals, stamp seals.
Seistan, pottery of, 64, 67.
Semites; arrival in Mesopotamia, 152 f., 174; connection with the First Dynasty of Kish, 150, 152; languages of, connection with the Hamitic group, 175; origin of, 175; physical type of, 5, 174; priority in Mesopotamia over the Sumerans, 81 f; probable traces at Tepe Gawra, 79, 82; relations with the Hurrans, 153 f.
šenni, Hurrian word for 'brother,' 142, 144.
Shehrizor, 95; as center of the Lullu, 88 f.
Shubari, city in Sumer, 38 ff., 44 f., 126; cf. *Ha. A.*
Shubaru, people, 90; allegedly blond, 104; in Assyrian annals, 104; slaves, 102 f.; cf. Subareans.
Shumer, possible origin of the name, 58.
Shuruppak, Sumerian city, 38 f., 42; archaic texts from, 54.
si, *še*-suffix, 44, 90, 98, 123.
sibilant formatives and suffixes, 44, 90; in Anatolia, 165 f.; in Haldian, 168; in Hurrian, 141; in Syria, 154; in the Zagros, 43, 47; cf. *aš*, *š*, *si*-suffix.
Sicily, alleged toponymic analogies with Elam and Lullu, 94.
Simaki mountain range in Lullu, 91.
Slaves, Gutian, 101 ff.
Stamp seals, from Susa I, 20, 66, 77; from Tepe Gawra, 66.
Subarean, language, confused with Akkadian, 129, 136; cf. Hurrian language.
Subareans, unsatisfactory designation for Hurrians, 135 ff.
Subari, used for Mitanni, 129.
Subartu, 87, 129; as a geographical term, 126; early occurrence of the name, 125 f.; interchanges with Ashur, 127.
Subir, 125 f.
Sumer, early contacts with Egypt, 2; origin of the name, 55.
Sumerian, dialects, 46 f., 174; new dialect from Kimash and Matka, 57; phonetic correspondences, 50 f.; cf., *Eme Ku*, *Eme Sal*; language, agglutinative character of, 13; influenced by the speech of the pre-Sumerian ethnic substratum, 47; interchange of liquids, 92; morphological characteristics, 3; phonology, 48.
Sumerians, comparatively late appearance in Mesopotamia, 46, 68 f., 174; cultural contributions, 85; decline, 176; origin, 83 f.; physical characteristics, 3 f.; relation to the semi-mythical dynasties, 149; con-

nection with the Jemdet Nasr people, 73, 75 f.
Susa I, see Aeneolithic I; analogues of, 63; highest development of, 67; northern origin of the style, 62, 66 f.; relations with Armenia, 66; remains different from those of the Sumerians, 67 f.; seals, 62.
Susa II, see Aeneolithic II; expansion of, 20 f.; origin of, 70 f.; pictographic script from, 71, 74.
Suti, 143.

Tarhu, 142 f.
Tarku, 143.
Tell Kaudeni, pottery of, 64.
Tell Zeidan, painted pottery of, 65.
Tepe Gawra, pottery of, 64 f.; polychrome ware from, 77; traces of Semitic occupation, 79, 82.
Teshup, *Tešup*, 114, 146, 168.
Theriomorph, vases, 20, 71 f., 77.
ti-suffix, in the Elamite group, 143; in Hurrian, 143; cf. *at*, *di*-suffix.
tl-sound, in Elamite, 28; in Gutian, 100; in Hattic, 123; in Lullu, 100.
Tukrish, language and people, 87, 96, 98, 163; origin of the name, 44.
Tupzah, king of Kish, 150 f.
Tursha, 144.
Turukki, Zagros people, 96.
Tushratta, letter of, 128 f., 136, 138.

Upi, variant of Akshak, 45.
Ur, aeneolithic deposits from, 64, 67; etymology of the name, 38, 92 f.; First Dynasty of, 34 f.; protodynastic graves of, 35; variants of the name, 92.
Urarṭu, 14, 96. Cf. Haldian, Uruaṭri.
Urbilum, 148
Urkish, 130, 148.
Urmia, pottery of, 65.
Uruaṭri, 96, 111.
Uruk, origin of the name, 92 f.
Ushpia, ruler of Ashur, 109 f.

Vannic, language, 8, 17; cf. Haldian.

wa-suffix, in Hurrian, 146.
Writing, possible non-Sumerian origin of, 75 f., 84. Cf. cuneiform writing.

Zagros, 87 f., 110, 117, 119, 169, 172; phonetic peculiarities of the Zagros languages, 92; as shelter of the Amorites, 153.
zah-suffix, in Hurrian, 151.
Zamua, land of the Lullu, 90 f., 100, 113, 154.
Ziusudra, 160.

Date Due

N 28 '38	~~FACULTY~~	
D 12 '38	~~FEB 2 3 [illegible]~~	
FACULTY	~~DEC [illegible] 1975~~	
O 11 '40	~~[illegible] 3 0 [illegible]~~	
FACULTY		
My 16 '46		
FACULTY		
FACULTY		
OC 20 '55		
FACULTY		
FACULTY		
~~FACULTY~~		
~~OCT 3 1 [illegible]~~		
~~FACULTY~~		
~~[illegible] '62~~		
~~JAN 9 [illegible]~~		
~~FACULTY~~		

DS73 .1.S74
Mesopotamian origins : the basic
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00134 5133